

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXIII

OCTOBER, 1930

NUMBER 4

A DIIS ELECTA: A CHAPTER IN THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF THE THIRD CENTURY

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE excavation of a site commonly gives us a neat and definite stratification of successive periods. Although the religious history of the Empire is less fortunate, nevertheless it has turning points and we can remark certain features as characteristic of particular periods. It is not that the phenomena in question are confined to these periods, but that they appear in them with special emphasis. The purpose of this paper is to consider a group of inscriptions which throw some light on the religious atmosphere of Rome in the middle of the third century of our era.¹

I

The Atrium Vestae at Rome contained a number of statues of Vestals, all of them, except the two first in the list appended, Vestals who had reached the dignity of *uirgo Vestalis maxima*. These statues are all dedicated either by relatives or by priests or members of the college of *fictores* or by those who were indebted to the powerful influence which a Vestal could use, and no doubt all needed official authorization. In the middle and second half of the third century we have a group of dedicatory inscriptions of special interest. In Nos. 11 and 12 of the list which follows we find a reference to the Senate's approbation of the Vestal's chastity and performance of duty. In Nos. 13 and 14 reference is made to Vesta's approval, *curius religiosam curam sacrorum et morum praedicabilem disciplinam numen*

¹ My thanks are due to Professor A. Alföldi, Mr. N. H. Baynes (to whose criticisms my fourth section is above all indebted), Mr. H. Mattingly, Mr. F. H. Sandbach, and Miss J. Toynbee for generous help.

quoque Vestae comprobavit (No. 13), cuius sanctissimam et religiosam curam sacror. quam per omnes gradus sacerdotii laudabili administratione operatur, numen sanctissimae Vestae matris comprobavit (No. 14, probably of the same year);² in No. 16, to the blessings which the state feels day by day, thanks to the same Vestal's excellence; in No. 21, a generation later, we read of a successor, cuius egregiam sanctitatem et in deorum infatigabilem sacrorum operationem meritis suis laudem aeternam adhibita gravitate numen quoque Vestae comprobavit; in No. 22, cuius sanctimonia a cunctis praedicatur; nunc certe pertinet esse te talem³ cuius laudem numen quoque Vestae honoravit (apparently quoting a poem); in No. 23, of the same successor, a diis electa, merito sibi talem antistitem numen Vestae reservare uoluit; in No. 24, gubernante Vesta matre; and in No. 25, cuius pios ritus ac plenam sacrorum erga deos administrationem urbis [for urbs] aeterna laude d. s. s. [for d(e) s(enatus) s(ententia)] comproba(uit), and her beneficiary speaks of her *divinis admonitionibus*. The repetition made of the ideas and phrases (*numen quoque*), which suggests a common model, and the fact that they are expressed not in literary panegyric but in the very Atrium and probably with express authorization, indicates that we have here no mere individual fancies. And in fact the main ideas here expressed — the supernatural testimony to a Vestal's excellence, the importance of her conduct to the state's welfare, and the view that she holds her office as the result of a vocation, are old.

For the first of these ideas we may recall the story of Aemilia, who, being under suspicion because through her negligence the fire had become extinguished, appealed to Vesta to deliver her if pure, and tearing a strip from her dress cast it on the altar, whereupon the flame leapt up. Also the story of Tuccia, who, to show her innocence on a charge of unchastity, invoked Vesta, went to the Tiber, drew water in a sieve, and carried it to the forum; her accusers were not found, dead or alive. Dionysius says that he could say much more about Vesta's ἐπιφάνειαι

² For 'comprobo,' cf. note 44, below.

³ E. Lommatzsch, *Carmina latina epigraphica*, 1920, interprets this as meaning 'now at least you ought to have a statue.'

(the word does not imply a visible manifestation of the goddess); his defence of himself for relating such phenomena deserves note.⁴ The elder Pliny, who dates the story of Tuccia in A.U.C. 518, says that her prayers were still extant, and states that it was believed in his own time that by their prayers Vestals could bind to the spot runaway slaves who had not left Rome.⁵ Again, we may note the story of Claudia Quinta. She had a place in the story of the arrival of Cybele's image at Rome. In time it came to be thought that she had drawn by her girdle the ship which bore the image of Cybele and ran aground, and that she had thus refuted suspicions of her chastity. In earlier tradition she is called a Roman matron, but later she appears instead as a Vestal. Herodian simply speaks of 'a Vestal' without naming her. A Vestal has therefore supernatural prerogatives in addition to her high human privileges.⁶

The second idea is fundamental. The normal testimony to the excellence of the Vestals is the welfare of the state. The younger Pliny relates how in Domitian's reign Cornelia the *Virgo Vestalis maxima*, when about to be buried alive, ex-

⁴ Dionys. Halicarn., *Ant. Rom.* ii. 68 f.; Propertius iv. 11, 53; Valerius Maximus, i. 1, 7.

On the coins of M. Lepidus, circa 65 B.C., we have a head of Aemilia, laureate and veiled (B. M. C. R. Rep. I, 450); on one of L. Livineius Regulus ca. B.C. 39, Aemilia standing with simpulum in her right hand and sceptre in her left (*ibid.* 580, clearly in honor, as Grueber remarks, of the triumvir Lepidus).

⁵ Nat. hist. xxviii. 13. Note also the story in Zosimus v. 38 of the effective curse of the old Vestal on Serena.

⁶ Münzer, *Pauly-Wissowa*, III, 2899 and E. Schmidt, *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*, VIII, 1 ff.; a supposed representation of Claudia Quinta with the legend 'Vestalis' on coins of C. Clodius C. f. Vestalis struck in B.C. 43 (B. M. C. R. Rep. I, 564). But she has a 'cymbium,' not the characteristic 'simpulum,' and I am inclined to share Groag's skepticism as to the connection (*Pauly-Wissowa*, IV, 105). If she is a Vestal, she may be, as Preuner suggests (*Hestia-Vesta*, 296), the Claudia who in 143 B.C. prevented a tribune from stopping her father's triumph. Miss Toynbee has drawn my attention to a medallion of Faustina the elder, showing Claudia Quinta accompanied by three women with torches; it is one of the series which she rightly regards as intended to stimulate public interest in preparation for Rome's 900th birthday in A.D. 147 (*Classical Review*, 1925, 170 ff.).

Servius Dan. in Aen. iii. 12 tells of two virgines who were sleeping 'in templo deorum,' presumably the temple of Vesta and the Penates, at Lavinium; the unchaste one was killed by lightning, the other felt nothing. Further, Ovid, *Fasti* iii. 699 ff., makes Vesta say that when Julius Caesar was attacked 'ipsa uirum rapui simulacraque nuda reliqui.'

claimed repeatedly, "*me Caesar incestam putat qua sacra faciente uicit, triumphauit?*"⁷ Symmachus, in his famous *Relatio* on the altar of Victory, speaks of *saluti publicae dicata uirginitas*, and asks, *quid iuuat saluti publicae castum corpus dicare et imperii aeternitatem caelestibus fulcire praesidiis, armis uestris aquilis uestris applicare uirtutes, pro omnibus efficacia uota suscipere, et ius cum omnibus non habere?*⁸ Prudentius, in replying to Symmachus and his complaint of the withdrawal of their revenues from the Vestals, says, *hoc illud meritum est, quod continuare feruntur excubias Latii pro maiestate palati, quod redimunt uitam populi procerumque salutem?*⁹ On the other hand, unchastity in a Vestal is a *prodigium*, which must be removed, like a two-headed child or any of the other indications given to the Roman people of unhealthy relations with heaven.¹⁰

As for the third idea, that of vocation, the procedure laid down in the *Lex Papia*, as quoted by Aulus Gellius (i.12), is that twenty maidens, neither under six nor over ten years of age, and not disqualified or entitled to exemption on any one of a number of specified grounds, should be chosen from the people at the discretion of the pontifex maximus. From them one was drawn by lot. In ancient ideas that implies a divine choice, and such a divine choice is not infrequently affirmed of priests.¹¹ In point of fact the use of the lot became unnecessary, and if any qualified person offered his daughter she was ac-

⁷ Ep. iv. 11, 7.

⁸ *Relatio* iii. 11, 14.

⁹ *Contra Symmachum* II, 1101 ff.; ib. 909 ff. he replies to the suggestion that this withdrawal has called forth famine as a sign of divine anger.

¹⁰ For this cf. Wissowa's admirable article, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XXII, and J. G. Frazer, *Fasti of Ovid*, iv. 270 f.

¹¹ *Classical Quarterly*, 1926, 107 ff. (priests of Asclepius [?] on Cos, of the African Saturn "[sac]erd. quos inposu[it]," of Zeus at Astypalaea, of Artemis on Patmos, actually of the members of a cult-association for the worship of Juppiter Dolichenus, 'quos elegit Juppiter optimus maximus Dolichenus sibi seruire'); [*ἀποδειχθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Διὸς καὶ αἰρεθεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς πατρίδος μου τὴν ἱερατείαν τοῦ Διὸς* at Hajarly (Philadelphieia?; Keil-von Premerstein, *Bericht über eine dritte Reise in Lydien*, Denkschrift, Vienna Academy, LVII, i. 31, No. 37); *ἐπιμελητῆς αἰρεθεὶς* 'Εφκᾶς πηγῆς ὑπὸ Ἰαριβῶλου τοῦ θεοῦ (Lebas-Waddington, *Explic. des inscriptions* 2571, A.D. 162; cf. notes 15, 16). On the significance of the lot cf. Ehrenberg's admirable discussion, *Pauly-Wissowa*, XIII, 1451 ff.

Mr. F. H. Sandbach has drawn my attention to an interesting parallel in the myth in Plutarch, *De facie in orbe lunae*, ch. 26. Certain Greeks chosen by lot go to the island of Kronos and serve him. After thirty years they are free to return home, but most do

cepted. It will be remembered that Augustus had to use pressure to obtain candidates for drawing by lot.¹² But it is likely that even when there was no sortitio the theory would remain unchanged: it usually does. And whatever the original meaning of *Amata* in the formula, *cipio te Amata*, it would certainly be open to interpretation as 'beloved one.'^{12a}

II

We can therefore trace back the ideas involved. But the formulation of them in this explicit way and with this warmth was perhaps new and requires explanation. It is certainly in line with much that we know from the hellenistic East. Instances of the supposed choice of a priest or priestess by a god have been noted. Further, Pausanias tells us that there was no admission to the temple of Isis at Tithorea except for those whom Isis selected and invited by dreams.¹³ Again, the idea of vocation in connection with the priesthood appears strongly in the inscription on the tomb of the high priest Petosiris, "I was subject to the lord of Hermopolis (Thoth) from my birth. As every one of his thoughts was in my heart, he chose me to administer his temple, for he knew that the fear of him was in my heart."¹⁴ For choice and approval, *reservare voluit* and *comprobavit*, we may compare the activities of Jahriboi: at Palmyra we find him not merely choosing the watcher of a spring¹⁵ but also bearing witness to the good conduct of the strategoi.¹⁶ Moreover, the

not (exactly like Vestals, we may remark). For this there are various reasons: ἐνίοις δὲ καὶ τὸ θεῖον ἐμποδῶν γίνεσθαι διανοηθεῖσιν ἀποπλεῖν, ὥσπερ συνήθεσι καὶ φίλοις ἐπιδεικνύμενον· οὐκ ὄναρ μόνον οὐδὲ διὰ συμβόλων ἀλλὰ καὶ φανερώς ἐντυγχάνειν πολλοὺς ὄψεσι δαιμόνων καὶ φωναῖς.

¹² Suet., Aug. 31, cumque in demortuae locum aliam capi oporteret ambirentque multi ne filias in sortem darent, adiuravit si cuiusquam neptium suarum competeret aetas, oblaturum se fuisse eam; Cassius Dio, iv. 22, 5.

^{12a} Cf. G. Giannelli, Il sacerdozio delle Vestali Romane, 54 ff.

¹³ Pausanias, x. 32, 13. Cf. Journal of Hellenic Studies, XLV, 95 ff.

¹⁴ Spiegelberg, Sitzungsberichte, Heidelberg Academy, 1922, iii. 4; Lefèbvre, Le tombeau de Petosiris, I, 137 (cf. 144, his 'exaltation' by Thot).

¹⁵ Note 11 above. On the spring cf. Clermont-Ganneau, Recueil d'archéologie orientale, II, 1 ff.; Dussand, Notes de mythologie syrienne, 74 (he suggests that the god gave oracles by means of the spring as at Aphaca [Zosimus i. 58]).

¹⁶ Lebas-Waddington 2598. ὡς διὰ ταῦτα μαρτυρηθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰαριβόλου καὶ ὑπὸ Ἰουλίου [Φιλίππου] τοῦ ἐξοχωτάτου ἐπάρχου τοῦ ἱεροῦ πραιτωρίου καὶ τῆς πατρίδος. We can imagine some sort of 'Gottesurteil' taking the place of a εὔθηνα.

belief that certain men were honored by gods is old in Greece, and appears in Asia Minor in connection with Hecate and other deities.¹⁷ That is to say, we have analogies not only for the idea of the normal choice of a priest by a god but also for the idea of the special grace of individuals. It is of course a natural idea that a priest or priestess stands between the people and its deity. For instance, the plinth of a statue at Sardis representing a young woman draped and wearing thick sandals, evidently a portrait statue of Moschine priestess of Artemis, has the inscription (an unpublished text which I quote by the courtesy of Mr. W. H. Buckler; probably first century B.C.):

Ἄρτεμι, Σάρδεις σῶζε διηνε[κ]ῆ[ς] εἰς ὁμόνοιαν
Μοσχίνης εὐχαῖς Διφίλῳ θυγατρὸς

(διηνεκῆς is my restoration). An extreme example of his mediating position is seen in the intercessory powers claimed by Alexander of Abonuteichus, who held himself to be the channel of grace from Glycon.¹⁸

It may therefore seem that there was in the third century a rise of religious sentiment towards Vesta, and that it clothed

¹⁷ Cf. Journal of Hellenic Studies, XLV, 100 f.; Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, XLI; on the concept in Homer, Nilsson, Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, XXII, 365; and under the empire, Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, 3d ed., 252 ff. Note also the striking phrase of Cleanthes' Hymn to Zeus, line 36, ὄφρ' ἂν τιμηθέντες ἀμειβώμεσθ' αὖ σε τιμῇ, also Sappho, fr. 128. 5 Diehl, *τετίμακ' ἔξοχά σ' Ἀφροδίτα*; as 'worth' of the goddess Theia in Pind. Isthm. 5, as interpreted by H. Fränkel, Gnomon, VI, 13, Schol. in Pind. Pyth., iii. 153a (ii. 84, 22 Drachmann); καὶ ὑπὸ θεῶν καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων τετιμῆσθαι; (of Cadmus) Plutarch, Q. G. 28, p. 297 E, Τένην ὡς τιμώμενον ὑπὸ Ἀπόλλωνος; and reliefs showing a person crowned by a deity (Demangel, B. C. H. L. 526). Cf. also Ignatius, ad Philadelph., 11, 2, *τιμῇσει αὐτοὺς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, εἰς ὃν ἐλπίζουσιν σαρκί, ψυχῇ, πνεύματι, πίστει, ἀγάπῃ, ὁμονοίᾳ*, picking up the previous *εἰς λόγον τιμῆς*, 'to do me honor,' as Smyrn. 9, ὁ τιμῶν ἐπίσκοπον ὑπὸ θεοῦ τετίμηται, according to a way of speaking common in Ignatius (cf. Lightfoot on Smyrn. 5); a prayer of Sarapion (Brightman, Journal of Theol. Studies, I, 102.36) *τίμησον τὴν ἁγίαν σου καὶ μόνην καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν*; and Artemidorus iii. 13 *θεὸς εἰ τις ὑπολάβοι γενέσθαι ἱερεὺς ἂν γένοιτο ἢ μάντις: τῆς γὰρ αὐτῆς τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ οὗτοι τυγχάνουσι τιμῆς* (honor from men): Lefébvre, Tombeau, I, 150, "qui honorera mon ka sera honoré"; 191, "qui louera mon ka, son ka sera loué".

¹⁸ Discussed by me, Classical Quarterly, 1928. The Sardis text has an interesting formal analogy to 'intercedente beato N.' in collects. For this intermediate position compare that claimed by Antiochus I of Commagene for himself after death: *νόμον τοῦτον καὶ τιμὰς ἡμέτερας διαφυλάσσων καὶ παρὰ τῆς ἐμῆς εὐχῆς ὕλως δαίμονας καὶ θεοὺς πάντας ἐχέτω*. Dittenberger, *Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae*, 383.

itself in the only forms which religious sentiment then had to wear: the Vestal who is chosen by the gods is so called not merely because she was *capta* in the ritual form, but because she seemed to have special grace. This choice or approval is predicated of two Vestals only, who may either have been distinguished by what were thought to be miracles or epiphaneiai (and the Heroicus of Philostratus shows us how strong the instinct to believe in such could be, in the early decades of the third century after Christ)¹⁹ or by some particularly strong popular conviction that the state's welfare at the time rested on their virtue. But the other Vestals honored in this same way clearly hold a position of very great popular respect, surrounded with a great aura of sanctity.

Reasons can be suggested for a rise of religious emotion towards Vesta. Caracalla was himself supposed to have sought to seduce one of the four Vestals whom he ordered to be buried alive.²⁰ But under Elagabalus there was much more serious interference with the cultus. Not merely did he openly marry the Vestal Aquilia Severa,²¹ but he is also said to have transferred the palladium to his bedchamber.²² According to another story he wished to transfer the fire of Vesta, the palladium, the *ancilia et omnia Romanis ueneranda*, to the temple of his god Elagabalus, and did in fact break into the holy of holies and seek to carry off the *penetrabile sacrum*. Instead the chief Vestal gave him one of a number of copies made to secure the safety of the real one, and he found it to be empty. But he carried off an image which he believed to be the palladium and set it in the temple of his god.²³

How much truth there is in this story we cannot say. The story of the copies of the *sacrum* may be based on the old tale of Demophon, who made a false palladium to give to Agamemnon and handed over the real palladium to Buzyges,²⁴ or

¹⁹ Cf. thereon S. Eitrem in *Symbolae Osloenses*, viii., and later. Marinus, *Life of Proclus*.

²⁰ Cassius Dio lxxvii. 16.

²¹ Ibid. lxxix. 9 (iii. 463 ed. Boissevain); Herodian v. 6, 3; cf. *Historia Augusta*, *vita Heliog.* 6, 5.

²² Herodian v. 6, 3.

²³ *Vita* 3, 4; 6, 7.

²⁴ Töpffer, *Attische Genealogie*, 146, to which Mr. C. T. Seltman kindly drew my attention.

on the story of the making of a number of *ancilia*: and it is clear that there was that in Elagabalus which made posterity inclined to add sensational and adventitious horrors to the picture. Still it is likely that he did in some way wound Roman feeling in this sensitive spot, and if so, the reaction against him may have evoked a certain religious sentiment towards Vesta. One of the first events in the reign of Severus Alexander was the return of the black stone of the god Elagabalus to Emesa and the restoration to various temples of the *sacra* taken from them to glorify his shrine.²⁵ There are indications of a rise of Roman feeling at this time. The statement about Alexander Severus (*Historia Augusta* xxviii. 7), *uolebat uideri originem de Romanorum gente trahere quia eum pudebat Syrum dici, maxime quod quodam tempore festo, ut solent, Antiochenses, Aegyptii, Alexandrini lacessuerant conuiciolis, et Syrum archisynagogum eum uocantes et archiereum*, cannot be quoted as definite evidence in view of the grave suspicion under which this life stands of giving a picture modelled on Julian, and, as N. H. Baynes, to whom we are indebted for this view of the life, suggests, the basis of the remark may be the Misopogon.²⁶ But the reaction does appear in the popularity of *ROMAE AETERNAE* on coins and in the dedications,²⁷ in the series of consecration coins of earlier *Divi* now ascribed to Trajan Decius,²⁸ and most strikingly in the fact that when Aurelian introduced sun-worship at Rome, he set himself to clothe it in Roman forms.²⁹ Any such rise of Roman feeling might find expression in devotion to Vesta.

²⁵ Cassius Dio lxxix. 21, 2; Herodian vi. 1, 3.

²⁶ N. H. Baynes, *The Historia Augusta*, 141 f. J. Bidez, *La Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, 390, regards the theory as "assez vraisemblable." The interesting text on Sinai (C. I. L. III, 86), 'cessent Syri ante Latinos Romanos,' is dated roughly by Mommsen with the remark "litterae sunt infimi aevi," and is regarded as possibly Byzantine. Whatever its time, it shows the attitude in question.

²⁷ For example, in Cohen, *Monnaies*, 2d ed., Alexander Severus, 519-526; Philip Senior, 164-170; Trebonianus, 105-108; Volusian, 112-114; Carus, 73; Diocletian, 431-432. As earlier under Hadrian, Mattingly-Sydenham, II, 370, 439; Antoninus, Cohen, 694, 698-703; Commodus, 647-650; Septimius Severus, 614-619; Caracalla, 554; Geta, 176. It is known that this sentiment was strong in Pannonia. In general cf. Friedländer-Wissowa, *Sittengeschichte Roms*, I, 32.

²⁸ Mattingly-Salisbury, *Numismatic Chronicle*, Fifth Series, 4 (1924), 235 ff.

²⁹ Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 367 f. I am much indebted to Mr. Baynes for drawing my attention to this and to Costa's discussion of the importance

As further signs of such devotion we may note not merely PUDICITIA types of Otacilia Severa and Herennia Etruscilla, perhaps suggestive of Vesta³⁰ (as Mr. Mattingly informs me, finds show that coins of these types were specially common, and the personification is now commonly qualified as AUGUSTA), and numerous normal coin-types of Vesta under Gallienus and Salonina, but also in particular a type of Salonina, struck in A.D. 257-258 and 258-259, with Vesta holding Victory and a palm and VESTA or (258-259) VESTA AETERNA as a legend.³¹ Common as Vesta is on coins, the only precedent I can find is a dupondius of Vitellius showing Vesta holding a trophy and sceptre.³² Ordinary Vesta types, as for instance a scene of sacrifice before her temple, are frequent on the images of empresses from Julia Domna onwards. For the esteem in which Vestals were held we have evidence in the Life of Valerian. We there read that in A.D. 251 Decius told him that his authority extended over all the people of Rome except the consules ordinarii, the rex sacrorum, and the *uirgo Vestalis maxima, si tamen incorrupta permanebit*.³³ It is moreover a striking fact that we find *u(iri) e(gregii)* as *fictores* of the Vestals, and that Nos. 10 and 11 of our texts record the giving of important official positions to men for whom the *uirgo Vestalis maxima* had made interest. It will further be recalled that, when Aurelian instituted his *pontifices dei Solis*, the old pontifices were called *pontifices Vestae matris*.³⁴

Eduard Schwartz has rightly emphasized as a dominant factor in the systematic persecutions of the Christian church which mark the second half of the third century and the beginning of the fourth the belief that the welfare of the empire depended on the maintenance of official religion.

Merkwürdigerweise haben nicht die Kaiser syrischer oder arabischer Herkunft diesen Vernichtungskrieg unternommen, obgleich der ganze Vorstel-

of Roman tradition for the Jovian and Herculian dynasties in Religione e Politica nell' Impero Romano.

³⁰ Mattingly-Salisbury, 234 f.

³¹ Mattingly-Sydenham-Webb, Roman Imperial Coinage, V, 109, No. 9; 115, Nos. 70, 71.

³² B. M. C. R. Emp. I, 383.

³³ Hist. Aug., vita Valer., 6.

³⁴ Marquardt-Wissowa, Römische Staatsverwaltung, 2d ed., III, 245.

lungskreis von dem unmittelbaren Zusammenhang zwischen der Frömmigkeit und der Unbesieglichkeit des Herrschers, wie er sich in der von Caracalla eingeführten Titulatur *pius felix invictus* ausprägt, aus den orientalischen Religionen und der orientalischen, fatalistischen Astrologie stammt. Nicht Mithras und *Sol invictus*, sondern die offiziellen römischen Götter sind gegen den christlichen Rivalen ins Feld geführt, allerdings weder von Römern noch von Hellenen, sondern von den Pannoniern und Illyriern, die der Erbitterung der tüchtigsten Grenzarmee über das schlaaffe Regiment orientalischer Kaiser den Purpur verdankten und wie sie ihre wilde Soldatenart für die Wiedergeburt altrömischer Kriegstüchtigkeit hielten, so auch in ihrem naiven Unteroffiziersglauben dachten mit militärischer Strenge das was sie für altrömische Frömmigkeit hielten, im ganzen Reich erzwingen zu können.³⁵

The indications which we have noted of a rise in the importance attached to Vesta are one side of the medallion, the organized persecutions are the other.

III

But why is a Vestal *a diis electa*? Why at most is she more than a *Vesta electa*? First, her position is fundamentally different from that of an ordinary priest or priestess of a specific deity. The Vestals continued for the benefit of the state the domestic cult of the king's household:³⁶ this meant rites to Vesta, rites to the Penates, and a series of ceremonial acts in which there was no specific deity involved. In No. 15 of our honorific inscriptions we find a Vestal praised *quae per omnes gradus sacerdotii apud divina altaria omnium deorum et ad aeternos ignes diebus noctibusque pia mente deseruiens merito ad hunc locum cum aetate peruenit*; in No. 30 the dedication to Terentia Rufilla has *in cerimonia antistiti deorum*; in No. 25, a text for Coelia Claudiana, 'the chosen of the gods,' we have *plenam sacrorum erga deos administrationem*; and in No. 2, for Flavia Mamilia, *in deos quoque peruigilem administrationem*. When Cicero is seeking to impress on the jury the importance which they should attach to the entreaty of the sister of Fonteius, herself a Vestal, he says, *quae pro uobis liberisque uestris tot*

³⁵ Kaiser Constantin und die christliche Kirche, 42.

³⁶ Technically Vesta's shrine is 'aedes,' not 'templum' (Varro ap. Aul. Gell. xiv. 7, 7: Wissowa in Roscher, Myth. Lex. VI, 248). Note in particular the phrases 'Vesta populi Romani Quiritium' and 'Vesta deorum dearumque' (on the latter Wissowa, l.c., 259). Vesta was invoked at the end of Roman public sacrifices, just as Janus was at the beginning (Wissowa, l.c., 257).

annos in dis immortalibus placandis occupata est ut ea nunc pro salute sua fratriſque ſui animos ueſtros placare poſſit [not in Vesta placanda occupata est] . . . nolite pati iudices aras deorum immortalium Vestaſque matris cotidianis uirginis lamentationibus de ueſtro iudicio commoneri . . . tendit ad uos uirgo Veſtalis manus ſupplices eaſdem quas pro uobis diſ immortalibus tendere conſuevit. He ſpeaks throughout of ſervice to the gods in general.³⁷ And if we turn to the actual form of words uſed in the 'taking' of a Veſtal, it is *quae ſacra faciat, quae ius ſiet ſacerdotem Veſtalem facere pro populo Romano*.³⁸

Secondly, we have to reckon with the vague uſe of *dei*. In Homer *θεός*, *θεοί*, *δαίμων*, *Ζεύς*, and words for Fate convey various nuances of meaning but are to ſome extent interchangeable,³⁹ and throughout Greek literature we find the uſe of *θεός*, *θεοί*, to denote the incalculable non-human element in phenomena, and of *θεός* for anything out of the ordinary, anything ſeemingly exempt from decay and other human limitations.⁴⁰ We may take two illuſtrations: the dialogue between Oreſtes and Menelaus in Eurip. Or. 418–420,

OP. δουλεύομεν θεοῖς, ὃ τι ποτ' εἰσὶν οἱ θεοί.

ME. κᾶτ' οὐκ ἀμύνει Δοξίας τοῖς σοῖς κακοῖς;

OP. μέλλει· τὸ θεῖον δ' ἐστὶ τοιοῦτον φύσει,

and the queſtion of Nisus in Aen. ix. 184–185,

*dine hunc ardorem mentibus addunt,
Euryale, an ſua cuique deus fit dira cupido?*

³⁷ Pro Fonteio 46–48. Cf. *Expositio totius mundi et gentium* (mid 4th cent. A.D.), which deſcribes the Veſtals as 'quae ſacra deorum pro ſalute ciuitatis ſecundum antiquorum morem perficiunt et uocantur uirgines Veſtae' (p. 72 f., line 446, ed. Lumbroſo); Dion. Hal., Ant. Rom. ix. 40, τὰ ἱερὰ θύει τὰ τῆς πόλεως οὐκ οὔσα καθαρά. In Caſſius Dio lx. 5, 2, we read that Claudius ordered the Veſtals to ſacrifice to Livia.

³⁸ Aul. Gell. i. 12, 14, citing Fabius Pictor.

³⁹ M. P. Nilſſon, *Archiv für Religionswiſſenſchaft*, XXII, 376; and on *δαίμων* K. Latte, *Actes V^{ème} Congr. Hist. Rel.* (1929), 186 f.; H. Bolkeſtein, *Religionsgeſchichtliche Verſuche und Vorarbeiten*, XXI, ii. 3 ff.; O. Immiſch, *Gnomon*, VI, 269 ff.

⁴⁰ Cf. W. H. S. Jones, *Classical Review*, 1913, 252 ff. and F. M. Cornford, *Greek Religious Thought from Homer to Alexander*, x ff. Cf. alſo Preiswerk's inſtructive ſtudy of phraſes ſuch as 'fato et ui Armini' in *ANTIDAMPON*, *Festschrift Jacob Wackernagel*, 51 ff., and, to take a late pagan example, Zosimus, i. 1, 2. ἀλλὰ τοῦτων μὲν οὐκ ἂν τις ἀνθρωπίνην ἰσχὺν αἰτιάſαιτο, Μοιρῶν δὲ ἀνάγκην ἢ ἀſτρώων κινήſεων ἀποκαταſτάſεις ἢ θεοῦ βούληſιν τοῖς ἐφ' ἡμῖν μετὰ τὸ δίκαιον ἀκόλουθον οῦſαν.

So Latin can use *deus, di, superi*: for instance, in Statius, Theb. i. 510, *deprendi, Fortuna, deos* means 'I have found out what heaven is meaning.'⁴¹ The word *di*, or *θεοί*, is a generalizing term like τὸ θεῖον, and dedications made *θεοῖς* or *τοῖς θεοῖς*⁴² are ultimately different from those made *πᾶσι θεοῖς, θεοῖς πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις*. In the former the worshipper addresses himself to a vague complex of divine power; in the latter to an aggregation of individuals. This distinction might not be felt in usage, but it rests ultimately on a real fact, namely, that in the popular imagination the individual deities, apart from such exceptions as Asclepius or the individual civic god or goddess in his or her own area, were probably not nearly so sharply personal as in Homer. Mythology is the response of man's imagination to the numinous, but this in itself postulates behind its developments a something with ill-defined outlines and taken seriously. Xenophanes does not say that Homer and Hesiod invented the gods, but that they ascribed to them all that is unseemly: πάντα θεοῖς ἀνέθηκαν 'Ομηρος θ' 'Ησίοδος τε. And when Homer makes a man say πάντες δὲ θεῶν χατέονσ' ἄνθρωποι, he is speaking with reference to the background of mythology; he does not mean that anyone feels a need of his Ares or of his Aphrodite. Much mythology remains throughout external and inorganic.⁴³ The phrase *a diis electa* means generally 'chosen by heaven': its use of *di* is parallel to that in *dis carus, dis inimicus*, or Horace's *non sine dis animosus infans*, or θεῶν εὐνοία, σὺν θεοῖς, θεῶν ἔκκῃ, but it is more pointed and more emphatic as coming from an atmosphere of special tension.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Cf. Statius, Theb. x. 670, 'rape mente deos, rape nobile fatum.'

⁴² For example, Petersen-von Luschan, *Reisen im südwestlichen Kleinasien*, II, 171, Μάνης Μίδου καὶ Ἀρτέμης Μίδου θεοῖς εὐχὴν, and 172, Ἀρτέμων Ἐρμῶν δις τ[οῖς θ]εοῖς εὐχὴν.

⁴³ For illustrations of this attitude under the Empire cf. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, xlv, 90 f.; *Revue des études anciennes*, xxx, 287. One may suffice here, a dedication at Frascati (Dessau, *Inscriptiones latinae selectae*, 3994), 'numini deorum d. d. Q. Naeuius Carpus.' For this external character of mythology, compare an Egyptian parallel in Norden, *Geburt des Kindes*, 82.

⁴⁴ Cf. Cicero, *De domo sua* 15, 'erant qui deos immortalis—id quod ego sentio—numine suo reditum meum dicerent comprobasse'; 17, 143, 'diuino me numine esse rei publicae redditum'; and *Post reditum ad Quirites* 18, 'dis denique immortalibus frugum ubertate copia uilitate reditum meum comprobantibus.' The plural can be

IV

The phrase has however a further interest and importance for us. It is part of the background of *instinctu diuinitatis, mentis magnitudine . . . iustis rempublicam ultus est armis*, on the Arch of Constantine.⁴⁵ Now while on Roman constitutional theory the princeps was, to use a phrase of Mr. Baynes, "the man-made delegate of the Roman state," yet in the eyes of hellenistic observers, who from the first completely failed to comprehend the Roman conception of the principate, he was the successor of earlier monarchs. They were often thought to rule in some way *dei gratia*, as God's vicegerents or representatives. We cannot here trace the history of this idea, which is quite different from the conception of the king as a god; it is sufficient to say that in various forms we find it in Egypt, Judaea, and Persia, that in Greece it goes back to Homer (Il. ii. 205), and that it is so natural an outcome of the very existence of monarchy that it is precarious to construct a pedigree.⁴⁶

If we are to understand the bearing of this on Rome, we must distinguish sharply between (a) the normal working theory of the principate, and the implications of what the princeps officially says or does, and (b) the metaphorical language used by men of letters, or the corresponding expressions in art. The former, apart from such exceptions as Caligula, Domitian, and Elagabalus, is substantively Roman and sober. There may be

used in a generalizing way; so in Phaedrus, App. 14, 33, 'fauorem caelitus', cf. 15 'Veneris misericordia'; cf. Thes. ling. Lat. VI, 384.61 ff., Ovid, Fasti iii. 705 (of the murderers of Julius Caesar) 'at quicumque nefas ausi, prohibente deorum numine.'

⁴⁵ Dessau, 694. On the compatibility of the phrase with contemporary paganism, cf. De Rossi, *Bulletino di archeologia cristiana*, 1863, 58.

⁴⁶ Cf. E. R. Goodenough, *Yale Classical Studies*, I. For Persia, cf. Casartelli in Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, VII, 721; for Semitic analogies, A. S. Tritton, *ib.* 726: cf. the folk-tale of the king designated by an elephant (L. H. Gray, *ib.* 721, Indian), or by a dove (W. Meyer, *Nachrichten*, Göttingen Academy, 1916, 781 ff.; Bousset, *ib.* 1917, 719; Gressmann, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XX, 1 ff., 323 ff.; Persian etc., as also by a ram). For Egypt, cf. Preisendanz, *Papyri magici graeci*, IV, 154. For the idea as Jewish, Strack-Billerbeck and Lietzmann on Rom. 13, 1; and as expressed by Jews in hellenistic literature, L. Cerfaux, *Le Muséon*, XXXVII, 29 ff., 58 ff. Note also Plut. Numa 6 ('God does not let the great justice which is in you lie dormant'), discussed by K. Scott, *Transactions of American Philological Association*, LX.

anticipations of the theory of divine choice to be found in the epithets *pius*, *felix*, *invictus*, on coins of the early third century after Christ, but the first explicit formulation of it would appear to be the work of Aurelian, who told the troops that they were in error if they supposed the choice of rulers to rest with them: God had given him the purple and fixed the length of his rule.⁴⁷ Diocletian and his co-regents definitely place their dynasties under the protection of Juppiter and Hercules, their supposed founders. To quote from a letter of Mr. Baynes, "The theory is introduced from political motives in all probability, to raise the emperor above the arbitrary whim of the praetorians. But its persistence is due to the influence of Constantine the Great, for whom the theory was the expression of a fact of personal experience. Constantine's religious policy issues from his unwavering and passionate conviction that he was 'the man of God'; that relationship had been substantiated by the crucial test of victory over the enemies of God — the God who had chosen him to achieve his purpose. This conviction it is which unifies the reign of Constantine, and he lived long enough to impress the stamp of his thought permanently upon the constitutional theory of the Empire." The literary expressions and representations in art, on the other hand, are, from the time of Augustus onwards, substantively hellenistic, unfettered, and unofficial. This sort of thing remains experimental, like all metaphors. 'Shall I compare thee to . . . ?' What is surprising is the length of time during which the official theory survives comparatively unaffected by unofficial views.

Divine choice, when it enters the official sphere, is something on which you can build to support the monarch: divine choice, as it figures outside that sphere, is rather something for which you use the personality or achievements of the monarch as supporting and substantiating it. In the first it is definite, in the second it is fluid. We have to reckon:

(1) with definite theories of divine right, as in *Corpus Hermeticum* xviii and in the phrase of Celsus ap. Origen, *Contra Celsum* viii. 63 *ὡς οὐδὲ τούτους* (sc. *τοὺς ἐν ἀνθρώποις δυνάστας καὶ βασιλέας*) *ἄνευ δαιμονίας ἰσχύος τῶν τῆδε ἡξιωμένους*,

⁴⁷ Anonymus in Müller, *Fragm. hist. gr.* IV, 197 [N. H. B.].

(2) with the very widely held belief in an unchangeable destiny indicated or fixed by the stars,

(3) with the idea of a capricious Τύχη or Fortuna moving the pieces on life's chessboard,

(4) with belief in a benevolent Providence, as in Virgil's *non haec sine numine diuom eueniunt* (in distress this may give us a Soter, or redeemer),⁴⁸

(5) with belief in the vigorous interposition of individual deities,

(6) with belief in the individual's luck or *felicitas*. Cicero says of Maximus, Marcellus, Scipio, Marius, and other great commanders: *fuit enim profecto quibusdam summis viris quaedam ad amplitudinem et ad gloriam et ad res magnas bene gerendas diuinitus adiuncta fortuna*,⁴⁹

(7) with belief in inspiration, as Statius, Theb. x, 632 ff. (in *Corp. Herm.* xviii this appears of orators, cf. *Περὶ Ψους* 13, 2; 16, 2),

(8) with the concept of the hierarchy: gods — emperor — man.⁵⁰

(9) with the idea of the emperor's piety (*PIETAS AVGVSTA*).⁵¹ These ideas are all present and fusing, as in the beginning of Pliny's Panegyric on Trajan: *non enim occulta potestate fatorum sed ab ipso Ioue coram ac palam repertus electus est, quippe inter*

⁴⁸ Compare the hellenistic inscriptions in honor of Augustus discussed in my 'Early Gentile Christianity' (in *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*, ed. A. E. J. Rawlinson), 89 f.; J. Stroux, *Philol.*, LXXXIV, 233 ff. on similar language of Quintus Curtius; and Alföldi, *Num. Chron.*, 5 Ser., IX (1929), 264 ff. on 'messianic' ideas in connection with Saloninus. The emperor is naturally protected by the gods; cf. such coin types as *MARS AVGVSTVS CONSERVATOR AVGVSTI*. On the Fourth Eclogue see now Alföldi, *Hermes*, LXV, 369 ff.

⁴⁹ *De imperio Cn. Pompeii* 47; cf. the 'luck' of Sulla.

⁵⁰ As Statius, *Silvae* iii. 3, 48 ff.

⁵¹ See A. Alföldi, *Fünfundzwanzig Jahre der römisch-germanischen Kommission*, 11-51, on the heavenward glance of Pannonian emperors in coin portraiture. On looking upwards as a ritual gesture, cf. F. J. Dölger, *Sol Salutis*, 2d ed., 301 ff.; Oph. Argon. 984; A. Rumpf, *Die Religion der Griechen* (H. Haas, *Bilderatlas zur Religionsgeschichte*, xiii-xiv) 49 (attitude of priest during sacrifice; a vase of about B.C. 420). For the empire, cf. also Cumont, *Textes et monuments relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*, I, 288, 291 f.; Costa, *Religione e Politica nell' Impero Romano*; Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, 110. For later development, cf. W. Staerk, *Festschrift Judeich*, 160 ff.

aras et altaria eodemque loci quem deus ille tam manifestus ac praesens quam caelum et sidera insedit. Pliny says later (10, 4), *iam te providentia deorum primum in locum prouexerat, tu adhuc in secundo resistere atque etiam senescere optabas.* This sentence leads one to a most useful way of putting a finger on the pulse of development. I mean the occurrence of PROVIDENTIA DEORVM on coins. PROVIDENT appears in connection with the worship of Augustus after his death;⁵² PROVIDENT AVGVS together with a radiate representation of Vespasian handing a globe to Titus on coins of the latter in A.D. 80-81⁵³ (this celebrates the fact that Vespasian by his foresight in providing for the succession had saved the Roman world from the prospect of more civil war). A similar PROVID type occurs à propos of Trajan's succession to Nerva.⁵⁴ Further, we have under Trajan a plain PROVID type showing the goddess, which Mattingly connects with Trajan's adoption of Hadrian,⁵⁵ and in Hadrian's later years we have PROVIDENTIA AVG, which may have reference to his adoption of Antoninus.⁵⁶ Earlier, under Hadrian, is found a curious and exceptional PROVIDENTIA AVGVSTI, with a representation of a woman standing looking left, holding plough-share and rake, and illustrating another aspect of imperial foresight.⁵⁷ All this is natural. The emperor's Providence on earth corresponds to the Providence of the gods: but we can also have PROVIDENTIA SENATVS under Nerva.⁵⁸ PROVIDENTIA AVGVSTI is a human quality glorified: PROVIDENTIA AVGVSTA can be the Providence which guards Augustus, as we infer from the sacrifices to her on occasions when the imperial house had been delivered from some peril.

The ruler of the world may naturally be thought to enjoy so much as this of supernatural assistance. Under Hadrian we

⁵² Mattingly, B. M. C. R. Emp., I, cxxxix, ccxxvi, 141.

⁵³ Mattingly-Sydenham, Roman Imperial Coinage, II, 128.

⁵⁴ Ib. 246.

⁵⁵ Journal of Roman Studies, XV, 212, following J. Vogt, Die Alexandrinischen Münzen, I, 109 f. Whether the adoption was an historical fact is of course open to doubt.

⁵⁶ Mattingly-Sydenham, II, 328, 370, 439, 444.

⁵⁷ Ib. 429.

⁵⁸ Ib. 221.

find something more explicit. On the coins ascribed by Mattingly and Sydenham on grounds of portraiture to A.D. 119–121 we have as reverse type PROVIDENTIA DEORVM, with Hadrian standing to front, looking left towards an eagle flying right, raising his right hand to receive a sceptre from the eagle and in his left hand holding a roll.⁵⁹ The eagle most naturally suggests the apotheosis of Trajan, and Hadrian is the heaven-appointed successor. The idea here has official expression, and we may perhaps see the result of Hadrian's hellenistic turn of mind. PROVIDENTIA DEORVM appears, but not in any such significant act, on coins of Antoninus,⁶⁰ M. Aurelius in A.D. 161–164 and in 171–172,⁶¹ L. Verus in 161–163⁶² (during the period of the Eastern campaign), Commodus in 180–183,⁶³ Pertinax,⁶⁴ Septimius Severus,⁶⁵ Caracalla,⁶⁶ Geta,⁶⁷ Macrinus,⁶⁸ Elagabalus,⁶⁹ Alexander Severus,⁷⁰ Balbinus,⁷¹ Pupienus.⁷² Over this long period there is no serious change, but under Aurelian the coins tell a different story. He has many coins with this legend, but, while retaining the ordinary type for PROVIDENTIA AUG, he has in PROVIDENTIA DEORVM one that is new: Fides standing right holding two ensigns and facing Sol, who stands left and

⁵⁹ Mattingly-Sydenham, II, 415, 418.

⁶⁰ Ib. III, 32, 35, 110, 114 (139 and 140–144 A.D.: winged thunderbolt accompanies the inscription), and a hybrid, 77 (Providentia holding globe and cornucopiae).

⁶¹ Ib. 215, 217, 218, 220, 278, 279, 296 (holding globe and cornucopiae).

⁶² Ib. 251, 253, 318.

⁶³ Ib. 402, 403, 404, 406, 407, 411 (holding wand over globe and sceptre). It should be noted that in A.D. 183 the Arval brothers made a vow to Providentia deorum pro salute imperatoris' (Henzen, *Acta fratrum Arvalium*, clxxxviii, 18); a medallion of Commodus, with reverse PROVIDENTIAE DEORVM, showing Commodus with three other persons sacrificing (Gnecchi, *I medaglioni romani*, II, 65, No. 123). Coins quoted hereafter as Nos. x–y are from Cohen, *Description historique des monnaies frappées sous l'Empire romain*, 2d ed.

⁶⁴ Nos. 39–53. Providence is raising both arms, or her right arm, towards a radiate globe, perhaps (as Cohen suggests) the comet which appeared under Commodus.

⁶⁵ No. 594.

⁶⁶ No. 525.

⁶⁷ Nos. 170–171.

⁶⁸ No. 108.

⁶⁹ Nos. 242–245.

⁷⁰ Nos. 513–515.

⁷¹ Nos. 23 ff.

⁷² No. 33.

holds the globe.⁷³ Very possibly, as Mr. Mattingly suggests to me, the sun is commending the emperor to the loyalty of the legions. This we find also on a coin of Severina.⁷⁴ It must be the deliberate expression of Aurelian's belief in the supernatural support of Sol, who figures so largely on his coinage.⁷⁵ The emperor Tacitus, in his few months of rule, issued more PROVIDENTIA DEORVM coins, some with this type, some with the traditional PROVIDENTIA type, one with the emperor standing right, holding the ensign and receiving the globe from Jupiter, who stands left and holds a sceptre.⁷⁶ Florian also has PROVIDEN DEOR coins, with Providentia and Sol.⁷⁷ Then Diocletian has a type PROVID DEORVM QVIES AVGG, with two personifications facing one another;⁷⁸ so also Maximian, who has again a PROVID DEORVM type of the traditional kind,⁷⁹ and this reappears on a coin of Constantius Chlorus and on one of Galerius.⁸⁰ Licinius struck PROVIDENTIAE CAESS coins showing Jupiter holding a globe on which stands Victory with a sceptre; this is the same as his IOVI CONSERVATORI type.⁸¹

A full investigation of the material by a competent numismatist is greatly to be desired, and would no doubt correct and supplement this picture of the development of the type. For the present purpose it is enough that we have this striking confirmation of the emergence of this idea in its developed form a little earlier than our *a diis electa*.

⁷³ Mattingly-Sydenham-Webb, V, i. 268, 281, 286, 294, 297.

⁷⁴ Ib. 316. For PROVIDENTIA AVG he has also once a type of Venus, once one of Mercury; 302 f.

⁷⁵ Cf. Homo, Aurélien, 366, and Julius, Caesares, p. 314, of him, "Ἡλῖος δὲ οὐμὸς δεσπότης αὐτῷ πρὸς τε τὰ ἄλλα βοηθῶν.

⁷⁶ Mattingly-Sydenham-Webb, V, 331, 345 f.; 327, 331, 336, 341; 331.

⁷⁷ Ib. 359 f.

⁷⁸ Cohen, Nos. 397, 404, 405, 422-426. Cf. J. Maurice, Numismatique Constantienne, II, cxviii f.; ib. III, 227, on a PROVIDENTIA DEORVM of Diocletian (Providentia and Tranquillitas facing).

⁷⁹ Cohen, Nos. 478, 482-484, 489-493; 479 f., 487 (this last with the P. D. Q. A. double type).

⁸⁰ No. 244; No. 181. PROVIDENTIA AVGG and CAES. or CAESS. naturally remain in use for "une vertu impériale" (Maurice).

⁸¹ Maurice, Num. Const., III, 39. Mr. Baynes has drawn my attention to E. Albertario's discussion of the late emergence of 'prouidentia' in Roman legal texts (Athenaeum, N. S., VI, 1928, 165 ff., 325 ff.).

Now the Vestals were in a close relationship to the imperial house. A Vestal chosen by heaven is the right channel of grace for blessings on an emperor chosen by heaven; at the same time he is Pontifex Maximus and they are, as it were, his household.⁸² Every Vestal is in a sense heaven-chosen: it is either a supposed miracle or else a particularly firm conviction that the state's prosperity reflects the excellence of the chief Vestal of the time which prompts the two formulations of heaven's choice or approval which we have found.

To sum up, we have here indications of a rise of religious sentiment towards the cult of Vesta in the middle of the third century after Christ. This sentiment expresses itself in forms which suit its ancient character but are in effect the expression of new religious emotion coinciding with an emphasis on Roman feeling and with a new crystallization of monarchic sentiment.

⁸² Thus in A.D. 23, to increase the prestige of the Vestals, it was voted '*quotiens Augusta [i.e. Livia] theatrum introisset, ut sedes inter Vestalium consideret*' (Tac. Ann. iv. 16. Cf. Mattingly, B. M. C. R. Emp. I, cxxxi, cxlvi, ccxxiv). Again, in Ovid, Fasti, iii. 699, Vesta says of Julius Caesar '*meus fuit ille sacerdos*.' The princeps commonly became pontifex maximus by an act separate from his accession; Mommsen, Röm. Staatsrecht, 3d ed., II, 1107.

APPENDIX

LIST OF DEDICATIONS OF STATUES OF VESTALS

(De indicates the number of the inscription in Dessau's selection)

Date	Name of Vestal	Dedicant	Remarks	References in C. I. L. VI
(1) early 1st cent. A.D. dated from Ann. iii. 69	The Juno of Junia Tor- quata described as <i>Sacerdos Vestalis</i>	a freedman Actius	(1) a cippus to her Juno. (Dedications to a woman's Juno also by freedmen, De 116, 3645) (2) Phrase, <i>caelesti patronae</i> , for which cf. Horace, Odes iv. 2, 18 (Olympic victors), Quintil. x. 2, 18 <i>caelestis huius in di- cendo auri</i> . Here there is the usual feeling towards a bene- factor	2128 (= De 4923)
(2)	Junia Torquata, VIR. VEST.	freedman Juvenio		2127
(3) end of 1st cent. A.D. dated from script and identification	Praetextata, Crassi fil. V. V. <i>maximae</i>	C. Julius Creticus a <i>sacris</i>		32409 (= De 4924); another fragment in her honor 32410
(4) Jan. 13, 201	Numisia Maximilla V. V. <i>mar.</i>	Ti. Jul. Balbillus s(acer- dos) Solis		2129
(5)	"	C. Helvidius Mysticus <i>deotus beneficiis eius</i>		32411 (= De 4925)

(6)	mentioned in <i>Acta</i> of Secular Games of A.D. 204 next to Nu- misia Maximilla	Terentia Flavola V. V. <i>max.</i>	Q. Lollianus, high mag- istrate, her brother	32412 (= De 1155)
(7)	"	"	Cn. Statilius Menander <i>factor</i> V. V. (alumnus of another <i>factor</i>)	32413 (= De 4926)
(8)	(spelled — ula in manu- script copies on which we depend)	"	her brother Terentius Gentianus <i>fl.</i> <i>Dial.</i> with his wife and nephew	2144 (= De 4927)
(9)	April 4, 213	"	Aurel. Julius Balbillus <i>sec. Sol.</i>	2130
(10)	May 12, 240	Campia Severina V. V. <i>max.</i>	Aemilius Pardalas trib. coh. I Aquitanicae	2131 (= De 4929)
(11)	"	"	Q. Veturius Callistratus	2132 (= De 4928)
(12)	March 21, 242	Flavia Mamilia V. V. <i>max.</i>	brother (Aemilius Ru- finus) and nephews	2133
(13)	March 11, 247 (?)	Flavia L. fl. Publicia V. V. <i>max.</i>	Q. Veturius Memphius v. e. <i>factor</i> V. V.	2134-32419 is identical but lacks date recorded as on left side of 2134 32414 (= De 4930)
(14)	July 11, 247 (?)	"	Aemilia Rogatilla, niece, with her son	cf. p. 252, above

LIST OF DEDICATIONS OF STATUES OF VESTALS (continued)

Date	Name of Vestal	Dedicant	Remarks	References in C.I.L. VI
(15) Sept. 30, 257	Flavia L. fil. Publicia <i>V. V. maz.</i>	Bareius Zoticus and his wife in gratitude	<i>quae per omnes gradus sacer- dotii apud diuina altaria om- nium deorum et ad aeternos ignes diebus noctibusque pia mente deserviens merito ad hunc locum cum aetate peruenit</i>	32416 (= De 4931)
(16)	"	Ulpius Verus and Aurel. Titus <i>centuriones depu- tati</i>	<i>cuius egregiam morum discipli- nam et in sacris peritissimam operationem merito res publica in dies feliciter sentit</i>	32415 (= De 4932)
(17)	"	Ti. Flav. Apronius <i>fle- tor V. V. loci secundi</i> and family	<i>dignissimae ac praestantissimae patronae</i>	32418 (= De 4933)
(18) 254, 255, or 257 (de- pends on a restora- tion)	"	Q. Terentius Rufus and Caenia Verissima, par- ents of a Vestal, Te- rentia Rufilla	<i>merito sanctissimae ac piissi- mae quae rite et peruigili administratione omnes gradus laude cumulata sacra sua uene- rata vivit ut saeculari aetate ministerio adsit et in futuro perseueret</i>	2135 (= De 4934)
(19)	"	M. Aurelius Hermes		32417
(20) 251	A pedestal for a statue of Vestal, now nameless, probably Publicia			Notizie, 1885, 187

- | | | | | |
|------|------------------|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| (21) | February 25, 286 | Coelia Claudiana V. V.
<i>mar.</i> | <i>sac(erdotes) sacrae urbis</i> | 2136 |
| (22) | March 1, 286 | " | Eucharistus Epictetus
Optatus sacerdotis <i>sacrae urbis de X prim.</i> | 2137
(= De 4986) |
| (23) | | " | Nerviana her sister with
husband and children | 2139
(= De 4985) |
| (24) | | " | Aurelius Fructuosus cli-
ens et candidatus be-
<i>nignitatis eius probatus</i> | 32420
(= De 4937) |
| (25) | | " | Octavia | 2138 |
| (26) | | " | her sister Nicomede | 2140 |
| (27) | | " | unknown | 32421 |
| (28) | December 19, 300 | Terentia Rufilla V. V.
<i>mar.</i> | Ael. Januaria | 2141 |
| (29) | | " | unknown | 2142 |
| (30) | | " | Eutyches | 2143 |
| (31) | June 9, 364 | (name erased) V. V. <i>mar.</i> | pontifices
<i>ob meritum castitatis pudicitiae
adq. in sacris religionibusque
doctrinae mirabilis</i> | 32422
(= De 4988) |

LIST OF DEDICATIONS OF STATUES OF VESTALS (continued)

Date	Name of Vestal	Dedicant	Remarks	References in C.I.L. VI
(32) end of 4th century	Coelia Concordia (<i>virgini Vestali maximae</i>) [but this is probably in house of Vettius Agorius Praetextatus]	Fabia Paulina, wife of Vettius	both <i>propter egregiam eius pudicitiam insignemque circa cultum divinum sanctitatem</i> and because she had put up a statue of Vettius	2145 (= De 1261) For the statue cf. Lanciani, Notizie, 1883, 462, and pl. 18.4

Undated fragments.

A dedication by the fictor Statilius Menander (C. I. L. VI, 32423); another [*contine]ntis uitae pudicitiae castitatis iuncta legem diuinitus datam decreto pontificum* (32424); another from a woman for services rendered (32425); another on which we read only *IMAE* (Notizie, 1883, 456, No. 15). A bronze tablet CALPURNIAE PRAETEXTAT V. V. MAXIM IMMUN (C. I. L. VI, 2146 = XV, 7127), another SOSSI[AE] MAXIM[AE] V. V. (VI, 2148 = XV, 7128), like that FLAVIAE PUBLICIAE V. V. MAXIMAE IMMUNIS IN IVGO (VI, 2147 = XV, 7126), are 'immunitas tablets.' Note also a discus BELLICIAE MODESTE V. V. (XV, 7129).

We may here note also C. I. L. VI, 2172 by priests in honor of a V. V. *maxima* of the Alban mount, undated, *summae sanctimoniae ac plenae religionis . . . sanctissime pie[n]tissime religiose [de sacri]s suis sollicitae men[te] ac disciplina.*

TWO NOTES ON VALENTINIAN THEOLOGY

ROBERT P. CASEY

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

I. VALENTINIAN MYTHS

IT HAS often been suggested that the principal gnostic myths had their origin in genuine folklore, and the difficulty of discovering traces of this lore outside of gnostic sources has been explained by supposing that the myths were Oriental¹ and were derived either from the oral traditions of localities in which no literature was produced or from literature which is no longer extant. Nothing favorable, however, to this view can be found from a comparison of gnostic myths with the native myths of Greece or with such Oriental mythology as is preserved unmixed with philosophic exegesis. In cases where known Greek,² Jewish, or Christian sources are borrowed for the myths, the effort to extract gnostic theology is as painful as in the worst attempts of the Stoic exegetes, but where the myth is distinctively gnostic the philosophic meaning is easily traced in the story's plot. The reason for this is evidently not that Oriental myths are more philosophic than Greek but that gnostic myths are in their origin artificial and symbolic. Reminiscences of Oriental fancy may occasionally appear, but they do not control the main structure of the plots and can usually be detected by the difficulty with which a philosophic meaning is attached to them.³ An underlying structure of thought in-

¹ Cf. W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Göttingen, 1907, pp. 1-9; and numerous studies of R. Reitzenstein.

² A conspicuous example of this is the Naassene document, Hippolytus Ref. v. 6 ff. Reitzenstein wishes to eliminate the Christian elements from this work as interpolations, and has reconstructed an imaginary original of which he assumes the present text to be a christianized revision. *Poimandres*, pp. 82 ff., *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus*, Warberg Studien VII, pp. 101 ff., 161 ff.; cf. my note 'Naassenes and Ophites', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 27, p. 374.

³ This has been pointed out with admirable clearness by H. H. Schaeder in the case of Manichaeism, *Urform und Fortbildung des manichäischen Systems*, Warberg Vorträge.

variably conditions the imaginative forms of gnostic myths, so that theological differences between related sects are often apparent only in minor variations in the development of the story. These variations are difficult to interpret in systems of which we have only a fragmentary knowledge, and it is dangerous to patch up one system with pieces derived from another, however admirably they may seem to fit. Unlike the Stoics, who started from popular myths, the natural products of unsophisticated imagination, and explained these as symbols of philosophic truth, the gnostics invented their own myths to suit their philosophy. In course of time the best of these inventions served as the basis for further allegorizing, and some of the later gnostics, like the authors of *Pistis Sophia*, forgot, or neglected, the philosophy of their masters and elaborated only the mythological elements in their theology. Since they were men of feeble abilities, they only made bad myths into worse ones, and obscured the philosophic meaning which was really symbolized in the earlier forms of the stories, stiff and artificial though they were.

For modern readers a certain vividness has been imported into gnostic mythology by the doubtful practice of transliterating the Greek abstract nouns that serve as names of the aeons and so making them appear as proper names. In English, *Nous*, *Monogenes*, *Horos*, *Sophia*, *Enthymesis*, and *Zoë* serve tolerably well as proper names and as such lend an individuality to the aeons who bore them which the abstractions 'Mind,' 'Only Begotten,' 'Limit' (or 'Definition'), 'Wisdom,' 'Thought,' and 'Life' could never convey. It must be remembered that to the original readers the names of the actors in the Valentinian stories were all familiar abstract nouns, and that the artificial and symbolical character of the stories told about them was thus brought out much more than it can be by a transliterated foreign word. A familiar parallel to the gnostic method of employing abstracts as transparent substitutes for proper names is found in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, and the loss of effect can be imagined in a translation of that allegory in which all the proper names should be preserved in their English form.

References to Greek poetry and mythology are not found in Valentinian theology; but the allegorical use of Jewish and Christian Scriptures exercised an important formative influence on the construction of the myths, and a study of their details shows that their form and content were suggested mainly by biblical texts, notably those of John 1 and Genesis 1.

In *Iren. i. 1, 18* (cf. *i. 1 ff.*)⁴ the starting point is John 1, 1. Following the clue suggested by the parallel developments of the same system, and paying attention to the names given to the heavenly powers, the influence of the biblical text upon the whole structure of thought becomes evident. When God uttered his word (*λόγος*), it was a sign for the opening of the drama of creation. But a being who could speak must have a truth (*ἀλήθεια*) to propound and a mind (*νοῦς*) capable of conceiving the truth. Previous to the formulation of truth, the divine mind was at rest (*ἐν ἀναπαύσει*) and in silence (*ἐν σιγῇ*), but even then it must have had an innate benevolent disposition (*χάρις*) or some vague undefined notion (*ἐννοια*) which needed the activity of mind to express it. Behind all these dispositions and capacities lies the abstract being of God, the progenitor (*προπάτωρ*) of all reality, the depth (*βυθός*) from which it emerged, indescribable (*ἄρρητος*) and incomprehensible (*ἀνευνόητος, ἀκατάληπτος*). However bizarre this psychological analysis of the Godhead may appear, it was plainly an important motive in Valentinian cosmology.

In *Iren. i. 6, 1* a psychological interest is evident when Thelema is raised to an equality with Ennoia and Bythos solely in order to emphasize the part of volition in the first divine disposition (*διάθεσις*) towards creation. In this scheme Bythos is reduced to the barest figurehead, for everything is accomplished by the union of the thought and volition which proceed from him.

In the system of Marcus⁵ a speculative interest is paramount, and the original Valentinian system is now radically altered, now fantastically elaborated, by the author's Pythagorean theory of numbers. Similarly in *Iren. i. 5, 3* a superstructure of useless aeons is erected above Bythos and Sige, and their

⁴ References are to Harvey's edition.

⁵ *Iren. i. 7 f.*

meaninglessness is emphasized by the pretentious negative terms that describe them. In Secundus's system (Iren. i. 5, 2) the introduction of the separation of aeons into 'right' and 'left' groups indicates incapacity for abstract thinking and the wish to substitute for it an imaginable mythology.

In the *Excerpta ex Theodoto* of Clement similar combinations of exegetical and speculative interests appear, and, as in Iren. i. 6, 1, a quaint interest in the analysis of the divine mind disturbs the nice balance of exegesis and philosophy.

In *Excerpta* 6-7 the ἀρχή of John 1, 1 is identified with Monogenes, or Nous, to whom divine rank is attributed on the basis of a well-known reading of John 1, 18, ὁ μονογενὴς θεός, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. This divine mind (Nous) is accompanied by truth (Aletheia) to formulate it, and possesses the power of expression (Logos). The utterance of truth produces life. This theory is symbolized by a genealogy that begins with the Father, from whom are derived the two pairs, Monogenes (Nous) and Aletheia, Logos and Zoë.

In *Excerpta* 7 the story is carried back beyond the emergence of Monogenes and forward from the point where the Logos within him is produced. Monogenes had complicated antecedents, and his birth was due to the Father's desire to be known to the aeons through the same medium, namely his ἐνθύμησις, by which he had knowledge of himself, ἄγνωστος οὖν ὁ πατὴρ ὢν ἠθέλησεν γνωσθῆναι τοῖς αἰῶσι, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐνθυμήσεως τῆς ἑαυτοῦ, ὡς ἂν ἑαυτὸν ἐγνωκώς, πνεῦμα γνώσεως οὔσης ἐν γνώσει προέβαλε τὸν Μονογενῆ· γέγονεν οὖν καὶ ὁ ἀπὸ γνώσεως, τουτέστι τῆς πατρικῆς ἐνθυμήσεως, προελθὼν γνώσις, τουτέστιν ὁ υἱός, ὅτι δι' υἱοῦ ὁ πατὴρ ἐγνωσθη. The original γνώσις (ἐν γνώσει) in this series seems to be an inalienable portion of the being of God from which is derived the πνεῦμα γνώσεως, also called simply γνώσις (ἀπὸ γνώσεως), which is the Father's ἐνθύμησις. From ἐνθύμησις, which in this connection might almost be translated 'subconscious mind,' emerged a third γνώσις, which is identical with Monogenes of *Excerpta* 6.

An awkward attempt to enrich the philosophy underlying this mythological speculation is found in *Excerpta* 7, 2. The point is that not only the divine mind but also the divine love

was operative in creation, and to express this a new aeon is invented who emanates from Aletheia and is called the 'Spirit of Love.' The same relation of *κρᾶσις* is thought to subsist between this aeon and Enthymesis as between Enthymesis and Aletheia, and this confuses the genealogy and so affects the symbolic accuracy of the myth.

The rest of Excerpta 7 plays with the meaning of John 1, 17 f., but its real point is that the mind (*νοῦς*) and speech (*λόγος*) of God are individually but not substantially distinct. The former, Monogenes, remains in the Father's bosom, that is the pleroma, and explains the Father's thought to the aeons; the latter descends and is visible upon earth as the incarnate Jesus. Nevertheless both are manifestations of the same underlying divine force: *καὶ οὐδέποτε τοῦ μείναντος ὁ καταβάς μερίζεται.*

A peculiarly happy development is found in Hippolytus, Ref. vi. 29-30. The system begins with a monad, the Father, who is sexless, partnerless, and unique, existing outside of space and time; and the description of his impulse to creation is one of the most charming examples of the naïveté with which the Valentinians confused abstract thought and pictorial representation: *πατήρ δὲ ἦν ἀγέννητος, οὐ τόπον ἔχων, οὐ χρόνον, οὐ σύμβουλον, οὐκ ἄλλην τινὰ κατ' οὐδένα τῶν τρόπων νοηθῆναι δυναμένην οὐσίαν· ἀλλὰ ἦν μόνος, ἡρεμῶν, ὡς λέγουσι, καὶ ἀναπαυόμενος αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ μόνος. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἦν γόνιμος, ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ ποτε τὸ κάλλιστον καὶ τελειώτατον ὃ εἶχεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, γεννῆσαι καὶ προαγαγεῖν· φιλήρημος γὰρ οὐκ ἦν, ἀγάπη γάρ, φησὶν, ἦν ὅλος, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγάπη, εἰ μὴ ἡ τὸ ἀγαπώμενον* (Ref. vi. 29, 5). He, therefore, projects a dyad, Nous and Aletheia, which was to serve as *κυρία καὶ ἀρχή καὶ μήτηρ πάντων τῶν ἐντὸς πληρώματος καταριθμουμένων αἰώνων ὑπ' αὐτῶν.* These then, in imitation of the Father, projected Logos and Zoë, and the latter pair in turn Anthropos and Ecclesia; whereupon Nous and Aletheia, rejoicing that their progeny were also fruitful, gave thanks to the Father and projected forthwith a perfect number of aeons, namely ten. The explanation of this is another curious example of abstraction and phantasy: *ἔδει γὰρ τέλειον ὄντα τὸν πατέρα ἀριθμῷ δοξάζεσθαι τελείῳ· τέλειος δὲ ἔστιν ὁ δέκα, ὅτι πρῶτος τῶν κατὰ πλήθος γινομένων οὗτός ἐστι τέλειος. τελειότερος δὲ ὁ Πατήρ, ὅτι ἀγέννητος ὢν μόνος διὰ*

πρώτης τῆς μίας συζυγίας τοῦ Νοῦ καὶ τῆς Ἀληθείας πάσας τὰς τῶν γενομένων προβαλεῖν εὐπόρησε ρίζας (Ref. vi. 29,8).

In comparison with many Valentinian systems, the sequence of thought in this genealogy of aeons is extraordinarily consistent. The Father's nature is conceived abstractly as pure, unmixed, and perfect being, but concretely as love, the essence of which is productivity and expression. The activity of abstract being, however, must be intellectual, and issues naturally in intelligence (Nous) and its counterpart, truth (Aletheia). Intelligence and truth also require expression in reason as speech (Logos), which in this connection is but reasoning out loud, and realization in life (Zoë). Reason and life in turn demand more definite formulation in man (Anthropos) and society, which last is represented by Ecclesia, since the church contains those who alone have any real connection with the ideal world, the pleroma, in which their abstract counterparts reside.

A somewhat similar scheme, which has affinities also with Excerpta ex Theodoto 6-7, is found in the Valentinian apocalypse set forth by Epiphanius, Panarion xxxi. 5-6.⁶ Here, in the account of the successive emanations, there is a marked emphasis on will and desire at the expense of thought. From an original dyad, Αὐτοπάτωρ (Βυθός, Μέγεθος, Ἀγέννητος, Αἰῶν ἀγήρατος) and Ἐννοια (Χάρις, Σιγή, Ἐνθύμησις), is produced a second couple, ὁ πατὴρ τῆς ἀληθείας and Φῶς. From this union, encouraged by Ἐννοια, emerged Ἀλήθεια, who, through commerce with her own father, bore a spiritual tetrad of Ἀνθρωπος, Ἐκκλησία, Λόγος, and Ζωή. Ἀνθρωπος and Ἐκκλησία then produced twelve, and Λόγος and Ζωή ten more aeons, which brought the number up to thirty. The difficulty then arose that the individual differentiation in the primary Ogdoad might be thought constitutive and injurious to its essential unity. Βυθός, therefore, to avoid this without disturbing the harmony of the τριακάς, withdrew the original Ogdoad from it and substituted eight other aeons. The withdrawal of the original Ogdoad from the τριακάς modified the status of the latter, which is now

⁶ Cf. my note on Epiphanius, Panarion xxxi. 5-6, Journal of Theological Studies, 29, p. 34.

called *τριακὰς ἀπηρτισμένη*. The restoration of this *τριακὰς*, cut off from unity with the primal Ogdoad, is effected through Sige's desire that all should be saved.

This desire takes the form of an intellectual passion for the second Ogdoad, substituted in the *τριακὰς* at the withdrawal of the original eight. This passion is the Holy Spirit, which Sige directs toward the second Ogdoad and by which she unites herself with it. The *τριακὰς*, once again substantially united with the original Ogdoad by its connection with Sige, now attains salvation.

This intricate combination of myth and thought illustrates the early stages of decline in Valentinian theology. Its author is not devoid of originality, and is still enough of a philosopher to prefer expressing his ideas (whatever happens to his mythology) to giving free rein to his fancy. He has, however, no ability to square the two and to modify the myth of his predecessors in such manner that it may gracefully and naturally symbolize his thought. His principal philosophic interest is to show that the motive behind the whole course of the phenomenal world was wilful desire and not clearly expressed thought. The tranquil *ἀγνοσία* of the Father in which all reality was once included was disturbed by the restless will of a notion, *Ἐννοία*, which occurred to him and which, desiring to share his position, induced him to coöperate with her in creation. Each successive stage of development is a fresh manifestation of wilfulness, until the last, when Sige, desirous of saving the world which she had so rashly called into being, tempered her desire with intelligence and transmitted to the *τριακὰς*, cut off by *Βυθός*, the saving knowledge through which it might be restored.

We have seen that it is possible to trace with some definiteness the existence of a rational plan in the early stages of the Valentinian emanations. This plan is frequently disturbed by vagaries of thought or fancy, but nevertheless possesses a certain philosophic significance as a less successful attempt to do what Plato had done in the *Timæus*. In the later stages of emanation, however, coherence disappears, and we are confronted with a conglomerate of abstractions which in spite of their arrangement in pairs appear to have no inner consist-

ency. Two samples of these lists are given by Hippolytus (vi. 30, 4-5): (1) Bythos and Mixis, Ageratos and Henosis, Autophanes and Hedone, Akinetos and Synkrasis, Monogenes and Makaria; (2) Parakletos and Pistis, Patrikos and Elpis, Matrikos and Agape, Aeinous and Synesis, Ekklesiastikos and Makoriotes, Theletos and Sophia (cf. *Iren.* i. 1, 1); and in the apocalypse quoted by Epiphanius (xxx. 6, 1) there is a similar list with some mathematical dyads, which on Pythagorean premises possessed a metaphysical significance, and a group called *τῆς μεσότητος νιοί*, who rejoice in the names Karpistes, Charisterios, Aphetos, and Metagogeus. This wild confusion in the later emanations indicates a sudden drop in speculative interest, and the reason for it is clear. In all the systems the authors have exhausted with the first few emanations their ideas on the rational basis of the universe, but in order to complete a 'perfect number' continue to populate the *κόσμος νοητός* with figures which do not make its noetic character more convincing. This Pythagorean element exercised an important influence on the formal construction of the Valentinian systems and is responsible for the addition to a reasonable, if somewhat mediocre, metaphysic of a hodgepodge of disconnected abstracts.

The most interesting figure in the Valentinian scheme is Sophia, for her unruly affections bring to life the impassive abstractions with which she is surrounded, and without her there would be neither movement nor plot. In dealing with her, however, a previous warning should be repeated that in Greek she has no proper name, but like the majority of the aeons is an abstract.⁷ Furthermore, her history is not the same in all the systems, and in the Epiphanian apocalypse she disappears altogether; and these facts are related to underlying speculative variations. Indeed, on closer examination Sophia proves to be much less a person than she at first appears, and her story, like the account of the earlier emanations, is little more than

⁷ According to Irenaeus i. 1, 17 his name was derived from Scripture, *καὶ τὸ ὄνομα δὲ αὐτῆς μεμνήσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἐν τῷ εἰρηκεῖναι, "καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς"* (Lk. 7, 35). *καὶ ὑπὸ Παύλου δὲ οὕτως, "σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τέλει"* (1 Cor. 2, 6).

a half-fanciful reflection of philosophic ideas. She is none the less a puzzling figure, and questions naturally suggest themselves as to whence she came and what she represents.

Both in Irenaeus and Hippolytus she is the last-projected of the aeons and the partner of *Θελητός*, but the occasion of her outbreak is differently described. In Hippolytus she reflects on the number and power of the aeons who have already been generated, but on investigation discovers that all these have produced offspring by union (*κατὰ συζυγίαν*), while the Father alone has produced without a partner (*ὁ δὲ πατήρ μόνος ἄζυγος ἐγέννησεν*).⁸ Not wishing to be outdone, she decides to produce by herself, ignorant of the fact that in the nature of things with the aeons the female can only provide the material for which the male supplies the power, and that the only exception to this is the Father, who is *ἀγέννητος*. Accordingly the product of her endeavors is a substance without form (*προέβαλεν οὖν ἡ Σοφία τοῦτο μόνον ὅπερ ἡδύνατο, οὐσίαν ἄμορφον καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστον*), a metaphysical abortion.⁹ The appearance of this strange creation in the *pleroma* produces the utmost confusion, for it introduces two novel and unwelcome elements, ignorance and formlessness. The other aeons are deeply concerned lest their own products degenerate into similar monstrosities, and, seeing Sophia's distress, beg the Father to quiet her. Taking pity on her tears, the Father orders *Nous* and *Aletheia* to produce another pair of aeons, *Christ* and the Holy Spirit, who repair the damage done by Sophia's neglect of *Theletos* by introducing form into Sophia's abortion and cutting it off from the *pleroma*. By a unique act, also, the Father projects a single aeon, *Stauros*, who is also called *Horos* and *Metochous*, to guard the *pleroma* and clearly to keep its perfection distinct from the deficiency (*τὸ ὑστέρημα*) outside. From this point on we hear no more of Sophia as we have hitherto known her, but from other sources it is fair to assume that she remained an aeon in the *pleroma*, where, in some systems, she continues to take an active part in later history. Her abortion, however, now formed and banished from the *pleroma*, takes her name and is

⁸ Ref. vi. 30, 6.

⁹ Ref. vi. 30, 8.

henceforth known as ἡ Σοφία ἔξω (Ref. vi. 31, 8-vi. 32, 4), ἡ ἔξω τοῦ πληρώματος Σοφία, or the Ogdoad.

This new aeon is herself destined to have a tragic history. The syzygy who formed her and cut her off from the pleroma are of no mind to keep her company, and when their work is done return to their parents Nous and Aletheia inside the pleroma, where the restoration of peace had brought such general satisfaction that the aeons decide that it is not enough to glorify the Father as usual in pairs, and combine to produce a single aeon to represent their united efforts. This aeon is called the Common Fruit of the Pleroma, Jesus, the Great High Priest. No sooner has he been projected than work is found for him to do. Sophia, who is outside, seeks in vain for the benefactor who gave her form, and not finding him is grieved and perplexed, and prays for his return. Taking pity on her, Christ and the aeons send her the Common Fruit as a partner to soothe her emotions, and this newcomer does for her much what Christ had done for her mother; he separates the troublesome part of her nature and establishes it in a realm of its own, the Hebdomad. Sophia suffered from fear (φόβος), grief (λύπη), supplication (ικετεία), and want (ἀπορία). The Common Fruit transformed these all into substances (ὑποστατοὶ οὐσίαι). From fear he made psychic substance (ψυχικὴ οὐσία), from grief material (ὕλική), from want the demons, and from supplication elevation, repentance, and power for the psychic substance.

The psychic substance is the creator of the phenomenal world; it is derived from fear, for Fear of the Lord "is the beginning of Wisdom" (ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου), is fiery in constitution, is called the Middle Place, the Hebdomad, the Ancient of Days, and is identical with the God of the Old Testament. Over against it stands matter (ἔλη), personified as the Devil and Beelzebub, the prince of demons, the 'Ruler of this World.' In man the body is of *hyle*, but within is a psychic element ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος (Eph. 3, 16), supplied to him by the demiurge. The present world is the immediate creation of the demiurge, but, contrary to his assumption and claims, he is not wholly responsible for it. Unconsciously he had been influenced by Sophia, who without revealing her existence or betraying her power

has superintended the entire affair. Furthermore, she and the Common Fruit have sown λόγοι in the world which may be appropriated by the soul and by which the soul comes to the knowledge of the mysteries of the universe, even of the existence of Bathos (Eph. 3, 18) and the aeons. There comes a time, however, when the revelation must be more general, and for this purpose Jesus appears, sent by Sophia and the Common Fruit, from whom he inherits his name. As Christ had formed Sophia, and Jesus, the Common Fruit, had consoled her daughter, so the appearance of Jesus rectified the evils of the present order and brought knowledge of the saving truth.

In Iren. i. 1, 2 a different account of Sophia is given. Here her original impulse is not to create as the Father creates, without a partner, but to know him as only he himself and his son, Monogenes, can. This ambition had a distintegrating effect upon her nature, and she would have lost her individuality altogether and dissolved in the Father's substance if she had not met with Horos, who guards the boundary of the divine magnitude and would not let her pass. He persuades her that the Father is really incomprehensible, and sets aside her original intention with its accompanying passion. This setting aside (ἀποθέσθαι τὴν ἐνθύμησιν) is the equivalent of the διαίρεσις τοῦ ἑκτρώματος, effected by Christ and the Holy Spirit in Ref. vi. 32, 2, and it resulted in a similar split in Sophia's personality. Irenaeus says expressly (i. 1, 4), what is understood in Hippolytus's source, that the original Sophia (ἡ ἄνω Σοφία, Iren. i. 1, 7) resumed her place in the pleroma, but the ἐνθύμησις, like the ἑκτρώμα in Hippolytus, proceeds to lead an independent life of her own.

The history of the dissociated ἐνθύμησις, who is also called Σοφία, the Mother, and Ἀχαμῶθ (ܐܚܡܘܬ), begins at Iren. i. 1, 7. After her expulsion from the pleroma, Monogenes, prompted by the Father, projects another pair of aeons, Christ and the Holy Spirit, not primarily to assist Enthymesis, as in Hippolytus, but to warn the other aeons that the Father is really unknowable except by Monogenes, and so to avert a repetition of Sophia's tragedy. The Holy Spirit introduces repose, and

teaches the aeons to occupy themselves with praising the Father. Christ also takes pity on Enthymesis and, extending his influence outside the pleroma, provides her with a form, *τῇ ἰδίᾳ δυνάμει μορφῶσαι μόρφωσιν τὴν κατ' οὐσίαν μόνον ἄλλ' οὐ τὴν κατὰ γνῶσιν*, which appears to mean that she acquired a certain structure without the capacity for higher knowledge which she later received. Immediately after this, Christ and the Holy Spirit depart for the pleroma, and Sophia, vainly seeking him, is prevented by Horos from entering the pleroma. Oppressed by her loneliness, she is again deeply distressed, and her various emotions, grief, fear, want, ignorance, and an inclination toward Christ who gave her life, became the stuff out of which the world was created. At this point Christ again takes pity on her and sends her the paraclete, or Saviour, who completes her formation by endowing her with knowledge (*κακείνον μορφῶσαι αὐτὴν μόρφωσιν τὴν κατὰ γνῶσιν καὶ ἴασιν τῶν παθῶν ποιήσασθαι αὐτῆς*), and, detaching her troublesome emotions, first transforms them into *ἄσώματος ὕλη* and then, by the addition of shape and form, into two substances, one evil and prone to passion, the other endowed with an inclination to better things. Achamoth, relieved of her suffering, rejoices greatly and produces two varieties of fruit, one *κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα*, the other *καθ' ὁμοίωσιν* (Gen. 1, 27), of the Saviour's satellite angels. The creation of the world proceeds as in Hippolytus's main source, though the details are somewhat more complicated. From the *ψυχικὴ οὐσία*, which was made from her fear, she creates the demiurge, who makes and rules the world under the illusion that he is acting for himself. A spiritual element is introduced into creation by Achamoth, and is assimilated by those destined for ultimate salvation and subsequently immune by nature from the danger of losing their salvation, in contrast with the *ψυχικοί*, who make up the Catholic Church and must win an inferior immortality by good works. The material (*ὕλικός*) element is incapable of salvation. When the spiritual seeds sown by Achamoth come to fruit, she will leave her position outside and enter the pleroma with her children, to be united in syzygy with the Saviour, while her children are given as brides to his angels. At this time also the demiurge and the *ψυχικοί* will advance to

the place formerly occupied by Achamoth, and the material world will be destroyed by a conflagration.

It should be evident that a personality capable of so many dissociations and divisions is no personality at all, but an abstraction, the dialectical significance of which is obscured by a mixture of inconsistent phantasy. The story of Sophia can be conceived but not imagined, for we are constantly interrupted in the attempt to envisage her tragedy by sudden and bizarre changes of imagery, and the only clue through the maze of curious incidents is the underlying theory which each event symbolizes and without which the plot cannot be understood. In this respect the Valentinian myth is quite different both from popular mythology, where a simple motive furnishes the basis for a tale, and from the philosophic mythology of Plato, where clear and consistent imagery by its very clearness and consistency conveys the desired meaning. The difficulty with Sophia is that she is neither prose nor poetry, neither a thought nor a fancy, but an unhappy mixture of both. Her origin, however, is in thought and not in imagination, as a comparison with the Stoic exetegetes shows. When Cornutus wishes to prove that Greek mythology contains a profound philosophic meaning, he is forced to employ the most shameless etymologies to depersonalize his gods and goddesses and convert them into abstract notions. In Valentinianism the problem is reversed, and the difficulty lies in the creation of individuality and character.

If we ask what the significance of Sophia is, the answer can hardly be doubtful, for it is given in her name. She is 'wisdom,' or, better, 'philosophy,'¹⁰ and her history typifies the functions and limitations of philosophy. To understand this, however, we must begin at the end of her story and work backward. She is saved and admitted to the pleroma through the *μόρφωσις κατὰ γνῶσιν* which she received from the Saviour. Previously she had only a substantial form, a kind of structure with which she was able to maintain a position between heaven and earth, having relations with both. Her mother, *ἡ ἄνω Σοφία*, of whom she was once an essential part, had been made un-

¹⁰ F. C. Burkitt, Note on Valentinian Terms in Irenaeus and Tertullian, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 25, p. 64, to which this paper is much indebted.

happy by her desire to investigate the mysteries of divine being unaided and in a manner opposed to the conditions inherent in the structure of the universe. The main theme here is evidently the contrast between philosophy aided by *γνῶσις* and philosophy not so aided. The former has a certain structure and place in the universe, but reaches its goal only when complemented and perfected by esoteric knowledge. This theory of knowledge in the individual is reflected in the history of the world, for human minds by their activity discover truth, but divine minds create it. The imperfection of the universe is to be explained in a way similar to the imperfection of human life. It is the product of a mind organized and capable up to a point, but lacking the saving knowledge which association and alliance with divine reality bring. In this connection it is essential to remember that knowledge is conceived as an assimilation of the matter understood, an assimilation not only of the content of ideas, but of their essential nature. The solution to human life, therefore, is emancipation from its material encumbrances and such a realization of divine truth as is possible only through revelation. The controlling forces of the world as we know it are in unstable equilibrium and must be in part destroyed, in part elevated. "Τλῆ and the ruler of this world, Beelzebub, are eliminated in the final conflagration, and the partial wisdom which has controlled the course of the world must be enlightened, and pass, with the souls who have shared its experience, into the realm of pure being. Thus by the same revelation of knowledge the imperfect principle of an imperfect universe, together with the imperfect souls who inhabit it, will be brought to a common completion and into common unity with the divine being.

A consideration of the other principal figures of Valentinian theology leads to similar conclusions about their nature. Monogenes, Christ, and the Saviour Jesus are but dissociated elements of orthodox christology, and their dissociation and rearrangement in the Valentinian scheme is another striking example of a characteristic incapacity to distinguish properly between the functions of thought and of imagination. In the orthodox thought of the time the second person of the Trinity

represented a combination of various elements, the historic Jesus, the Heavenly Christ, the λόγος προφορικός, and finally the λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, indistinguishable from the essence of the God-head; but these elements were all focussed in an individuality, capable on the one hand of clear representation by the imagination, on the other of theological evaluation by reason. In Valentinianism this individuality is multiplied by three, of no one of which is either a clear notion or a vivid picture possible.

Horos-Stauros also suffers from the same confusion. He appears at times to be the definition which limits the contents of the divine thought and so preserves its consistency and integrity, and again, or rather at the same time, to be the stake which fences off the territory of the pleroma or of the being of Bythos.¹¹ He comprises two forces, δύο ἐνεργείας ἔχειν αὐτὸν ἀποφαινόμενοι, τὴν ἐδραστικὴν καὶ τὴν μεριστικὴν· καὶ καθὰ μὲν ἐδράζει καὶ στηρίζει, Σταυρὸν εἶναι· καθὸ δὲ μερίζει καὶ διορίζει Ὅρον, and he prevents Sophia from re-entering the pleroma. He comes to life, however, only sufficiently to say *iaô* to Sophia as she approaches the borders of the pleroma, and is thereafter called *Ἰαώ*. Various attempts have been made to explain this name, and philological ingenuity has been employed to connect it with the Hebrew tetragrammaton. There is, however, no other evidence that Horos was associated with Jehovah, and this appears to be excluded by the later unambiguous identification of Jehovah with the demiurge. The text reads καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὸν Ὅρον κωλύοντα αὐτὴν τῆς εἰς τοῦμπροσθεν ὁρμῆς εἰπεῖν *iaô*. ὅθεν τὸ Ἰαώ ὄνομα γεγενῆσθαι φάσκουσι. It is possible that *iaô* may be a magic word¹² like the jargon at the end of the Epiphanian apocalypse, but it is equally possible that it is only a growl of warning, 'Eeow!' and that it is taken over as a kind of nickname from the one occasion on which this forbidding personage was known to make a remark.

In attempting to find a formula for Valentinian theology, account must be taken of three factors: (1) an eclectic philosophy of the type usually connected with the name Poseidonius, (2)

¹¹ Cf. Burkitt, pp. 65 f.

¹² Cf. W. Anz, Ursprung des Gnostizismus, Texte und Untersuchungen, XV, 1, pp. 7-8.

speculation on biblical texts, and (3) Pythagorean theories of number. The first of these furnished the substance of thought, a cosmology and a kind of metaphysic, borrowed without too fine a sense of discrimination from Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoa, and put to the use of a variety of theological interests. Philo was a pioneer in adapting Jewish religious tradition to this philosophy, and his influence on gnosticism, especially on those sects which, like Valentinianism, were native to Alexandria, has yet to be fully estimated. The second factor supplied the most characteristic features of the form in which Valentinian theology was cast, especially its cosmology and its doctrine of salvation. The third factor also exercised a certain influence on the formal character of most of the systems, and played a preponderant rôle in the theology of Marcus. All three factors, however, were subservient to a central religious interest, the desire for unity, which was not original but was striking in its persistency and intensity. As with Plato, unity in the individual, in the cosmos, in ultimate reality, and unity of all with the ultimate reality was conceived as the final goal, in direct antithesis to the actual disorder and confusion of the phenomenal world. The merits and defects of Valentinianism are to be explained by the fact that its theology was an attempt to approximate to a Christian Platonism. It succeeded in correctly defining its aim, but failed to learn either from Plato or his Christian successors that simplicity was not only the end but was the sole means by which that end could be attained. The way from the last product of Sophia's distress back to the unity of the pleroma was too long and complicated, though it led in the right direction.

II. THE EASTERN AND ITALIAN SCHOOLS OF VALENTINIANISM

THE distinction between the Eastern and Italian forms of Valentinian christology is drawn by Hippolytus in Ref. vi. 35, 4-9:

περὶ τούτου (i.e. the constitution of Jesus' body) ζήτησις μεγάλη ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς καὶ σχισμάτων καὶ διαφορᾶς ἀφορμή. καὶ γέγονεν ἐντεῦθεν ἡ διδασκαλία αὐτῶν διηρημένη, καὶ καλεῖται ἡ μὲν ἀνατολική τις διδασκαλία κατ' αὐτούς, ἡ δὲ Ἰταλιωτική. οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, ὧν ἐστὶν Ἡρακλέων καὶ Πτολεμαῖος, ψυχικὸν φασι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ γεγονέναι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰ κατελήλυθε, τουτέστιν ὁ λόγος ὁ τῆς μητρὸς ἄνωθεν τῆς Σοφίας, καὶ (ἐγ)γένετο τῷ ψυχικῷ καὶ ἐγήγερκεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. τοῦτό ἐστι, φησί, τὸ εἰρημένον. "ὁ ἐγείρας Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ζωοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν," ἦτοι ψυχικά, ὁ χοῦς γὰρ ὑπὸ κατάραν ἐλήλυθε. "γῆ γάρ," φησὶν, "εἰ, καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσῃ." οἱ δ' αὖ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς λέγουσιν, ὧν ἐστὶν Ἀξιόνικος καὶ (Β)αρδησιάνης, ὅτι πνευματικὸν ἦν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ σωτῆρος. πνεῦμα γὰρ ἅγιον ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν Μαρίαν, τουτέστιν ἡ Σοφία, καὶ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Ὑψίστου, ἡ δημιουργικὴ τέχνη, ἵνα διαπλασθῇ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τῇ Μαρίᾳ δοθέν.

In order to understand this properly it is necessary to examine with some care the structure of Hippolytus' account of Valentinian teaching in Ref. vi. 21-37. He begins with a description of Platonic and Pythagorean teaching (vi. 21-28), in order to show that Valentinus is a descendant of the philosophers, not a true exponent of Christianity,¹ and goes on to explain that the whole Valentinian school follows Pythagoras in postulating a first principle which they call the Father, but that they differ among themselves² in that some maintain that the Father is *ἄθλην καὶ ἄζυγον καὶ μόνον*, while others consider it impossible to derive the universe from a single male principle and so ascribe to him a partner, *Σιγῇ*.³ Hippolytus says that

¹ Ref. vi. 29, 1 (Wendland, p. 155.15) τοιαύτη τις, ὡς ἐν κεφαλαίοις εἰπεῖν ἐπελθόντα, ἡ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλάτωνος συνέστηκε δόξα, ἀφ' ἧς Οὐαλεντίνος, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελίων, τὴν αἵρεσιν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ συναγαγών, ὡς ἐπιδείξομεν, δικαίως Πυθαγορικός καὶ Πλατωνικός, οὐ Χριστιανὸς λογισθεῖη.

² Ref. vi. 29, 3 (W. 155.25-156.6).

³ Ref. vi. 29, 4 (W. 156.4) τὰ δὲ νῦν αὐτοὶ ἡμεῖς φυλάττοντες τὴν Πυθαγόρειον ἀρχήν, μίαν οὖσαν καὶ ἄζυγον, ἄθλην, ἀπροσδεή, μνημονεύσαντες ὅς' ἐκεῖνοι διδάσκουσι ἐροῦμεν.

he proposes to follow a source of the first type and begins his extract from it at once.⁴ The following sections contain an extraordinarily full account of a Valentinian system, all apparently derived from the same document, which is sometimes quoted, sometimes summarized, so as to make a substantial, connected description.⁵ The sequence is, however, occasionally broken by Hippolytus' remarks on variations of opinion among the Valentinians: on their view of Sige, vi. 29, 3-4; on the parentage of the aeons, vi. 30, 4-5; on whether Sige should be reckoned with the thirty aeons, vi. 31, 3; on the names given to the *ψυχικὴ οὐσία*, vi. 32, 7; and finally on the nature of Jesus' body, a disagreement which determined the difference between the Eastern and Italian doctrines.

It is evident that the last is only one of a number of doctrinal differences familiar to Hippolytus, and the question naturally arises whether he learned of them from the same source from which he took his main account of their teaching or from elsewhere. With regard to the distinction between the Eastern and Italian views the question is easily answered. The Italian theory was that the body of Jesus was originally a 'natural'

⁴ Ref. vi. 29, 5 (W. 156.8). The text is unfortunately corrupt at the start but should probably read *ἢν ποτε ὅτε ἄλλως, φησί, γεννητὸν οὐδέν κ. τ. λ.*

⁵ Although a largely subjective procedure is involved, it is possible to indicate with tolerable satisfactoriness whether the source is being directly quoted, closely paraphrased, or broadly summarized: Wendland, p. 156.8-12, quotation; 156.12-14, probably a quotation but with something left out between *μόνος* and *ἐπέι*; 156.14-15, quotation; 156.15-24, close paraphrase; 156.24-157.2, quotation; 157.2-10 close paraphrase; 157.10-158.6, summary; 158.7-8, quotation; 158.9-10, summary; 158.11-14, quotation; 158.15-21, paraphrase; 158.21-22 *ἐκλαίε . . . ἐκτρώματι*, quotation; 158.22-24, paraphrase with probably considerable condensation; 158.24-26, quotation; 158.26-159.2, summary; 159.2-12, paraphrase; 159.12-16, quotation; 159.16-161.2, paraphrase, but I am inclined to think at points very closely following the text, for instance, 160.12-16 (it would be interesting to know whether it was customary in Valentinian dogmatic works to mark the close of the story within the *pleroma* and the beginning of its continuance outside, as in W. p. 160.7; this occurs also in Irenaeus, who is not Hippolytus' source at this point); 161.2-5, quotation; 161.5-6, quotation to *ψυχικὴ οὐσία*; 161.6-8, summary to *ψυχικοῦ*; 161.8 *δν . . . δημιουργόν*, paraphrase; 161.9-20, quotation; 162.1-4, paraphrase; 162.4-9, quotation; 162.10-21, summary; 162.21-163.19, paraphrase; 163.19-164.6, quotation; 164.7-8, summary; 164.8-165.2, quotation; 165.2-5, summary; 162.5-17, quotation; 165.18-19, Hippolytus; 165.19-166.10, quotation; 166.10-14, summary; 167.9-168.3, probably, but not certainly, from the same source.

one (ψυχικόν) and only received the Spirit, the Logos of the superior Sophia, at the baptism, when it descended upon him in the form of a dove. The Eastern theory was that the body of Jesus was spiritual (πνευματικόν) from its birth, since the Spirit, that is, Sophia, coöperated with the demiurge in producing it. A comparison of Ref. vi. 35, 7 with vi. 35, 3-4 shows that there can be no doubt that the theology of Hippolytus' principal source was of an Eastern type.

Ref. vi. 35, 7

οἱ δ' αὖ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνατολῆς λέγουσιν . . . ὅτι πνευματικὸν ἦν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ σωτήρος· πνεῦμα γὰρ ἅγιον ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν Μαρίαν, τουτέστιν ἡ Σοφία, καὶ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Ὑψίστου, ἡ δημιουργικὴ τέχνη, ἵνα διαπλασθῇ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τῇ Μαρίᾳ δοθέν.

Ref. vi. 35, 3-4

γεγέννηται ὁ Ἰησοῦς διὰ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον· “ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ ” — πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἡ Σοφία — “ καὶ δύναμις Ὑψίστου ἐπίσκιᾷσει σοι ” — “ Ὑψιστός ἐστιν ὁ δημιουργός — “ διὸ τὸ γεννῶμενον ἐκ σοῦ ἅγιον κληθήσεται.” γεγέννηται γὰρ οὐκ ἀπὸ Ὑψίστου μόνου, ὥσπερ οἱ κατὰ τὸν Ἀδὰμ κτισθέντες ἀπὸ μόνου ἐκτίσθησαν τοῦ Ὑψίστου, τουτέστι [τῆς Σοφίας καὶ] τοῦ δημιουργοῦ·, ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος, ὁ ἀπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου (καὶ τοῦ Ὑψίστου), τουτέστι τῆς Σοφίας καὶ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ, ἵνα τὴν μὲν πλάσιν καὶ κατασκευὴν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ ὁ δημιουργὸς καταρτίσῃ, τὴν δὲ οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα παράσχῃ τὸ ἅγιον καὶ γένηται λόγος ἐπουράνιος ἀπὸ τῆς ὀγδοάδος γεννηθεὶς διὰ Μαρίας.

But the description of the Western view is also assisted by a quotation from the main source, Ref. vi. 35, 6 (W. 165.10) *τοῦτὸ ἐστίν, φησί, τὸ εἰρημένον . . . ἀπελεύση* (quoted above), which produces an exegesis of two verses of Scripture in its support. It is impossible to suppose that this source was not a Valentinian work, for Valentinian views are consistently maintained and supported by proof-texts in the quotations from it, so that the only likely explanation appears to be that it was a Valentinian document in which differences within the

sect were alluded to and one view defended against others. It is possible that all the sectarian differences noted by Hippolytus were derived from this source, but it is quite certain that the distinction between the Eastern and Italian doctrines came from it. Furthermore, this distinction appears to be well known, and older than Hippolytus, for in the title of Clement's *Excerpta ex Theodoto* there is an allusion to τῆς ἀνατολικῆς καλουμένης διδασκαλίας which was no doubt derived from the Valentinian literature that Clement had been reading.

We may now ask what help this distinction between the Eastern and Italian doctrines affords for the classification of the Valentinian systems about which we possess information. Ref. vi. 35, 6 states categorically that Ptolemy and Heracleon held the Italian view, and that Axionicus and Bardesanes advocated the Eastern. Unfortunately we possess no trustworthy account elsewhere of this portion of Ptolemy's teaching, but a fragment of Heracleon confirms the statement of Hippolytus' source. Heracleon's interpretation of John 1, 27, "the latchet of whose shoe I am not worthy to unloose," was:

οὐκ ἐγὼ εἰμι ἱκανὸς ἵνα δι' ἐμέ κατέλθῃ ἀπὸ μεγέθους, καὶ σάρκα λάβῃ ὡς ὑπόδημα περὶ ἧς ἐγὼ λόγον ἀποδοῦναι οὐ δύναμαι, οὐδὲ διηγῆσασθαι ἢ ἐπιλύσαι τὴν περὶ τῆς αὐτῆς οἰκονομίας,⁶

and the σάρκα which Jesus took here is the equivalent of ψυχικόν . . . τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ in Ref. vii. 35, 6.

Of the two representatives of the Eastern teaching mentioned by Hippolytus, Axionicus is known only from a remark of Tertullian, Adv. Valentinianos 4 (Kroymann, p. 181), *solus ad hodiernum Antiochiae Axionicus memoriam Valentini integra custodia regulorum eius consolatur*, which can hardly be pressed to apply to all details of doctrine. The problem of Bardesanes' antecedents is a difficult one,⁷ but the evidence that he was once

⁶ Origen, Comm. in Johannem vi. 39 (23) (Preuschen, p. 148); A. E. Brooke, *The Fragments of Heracleon, Texts and Studies*, I. 4, Cambridge, 1891, p. 64.

⁷ F. C. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*; F. J. A. Hort, article in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, I, p. 255; A. Hilgenfeld, *Bardesanes der letzte Gnostiker*, Leipzig, 1864; A. Merx, *Bardesanes von Edessa*, Halle, 1863.

a Valentinian is strong,⁸ however little this may have influenced his later teaching.⁹ So far as his christology is concerned, Philoxenus ascribes to him the view that Christ's body came from heaven, and Ephraim accuses him of docetism. Marinus, the Bardesanean of *De recta fide* (who is, however, a more questionable witness), not only declares that the body of Jesus was heavenly (*οὐράνιον*), but also employs the Valentinian formula found in Irenaeus, that it passed through the Virgin Mary "like water through a sieve."¹⁰ None of this evidence, however, helps in classifying Bardesanes' christology under the Eastern or the Italian form of Valentinian thought, for to say that Jesus' body was heavenly is not the equivalent of saying that it brought the spiritual element with it at birth, and a view similar to that of Marinus is advanced in *Iren. i. 1, 13 (H)* in connection with an Italian theory.

⁸ Eusebius, *H. E.* iv. 30. For other notices cf. Harnack, *Geschichte der althristlichen Litteratur*, I, pp. 184 ff.

⁹ The possibility of this influence should not be underestimated, and is suggested by a passage in the treatise *Against Bardesanes*, 71-74 (C. W. Mitchell, *St. Ephraim's Prose Refutations*, pp. lxxvii, 164-165): "And [the] word, the argument of which is something else, he makes into stuff for his argument, for he considered about this same death that the souls which are hindered in every place, in all depths and Limbos and that 'have kept the word of our Lord' . . . from within the Body, are exalted to the Bridal Chamber of Light. According to the doctrine of Bardaisan the Death that Adam brought in was a hindrance to Souls in that they were hindered at the Crossing-place because the sin of Adam hindered them, 'and the Life,' he [says], 'that our Lord brought us, is that he taught verity and ascended and [brought] them across into the Kingdom.' 'Therefore,' he says, 'our Lord taught us that "everyone that keepeth My Word death forever he shall not taste," that his soul is not hindered when it crosses at the Crossing-place like the hindrance of old wherewith the Souls were hindered before our Saviour had come. He is caught in one of two things: — in that everyone that kept the Word of our Lord — (and) died before our Lord; . . . — but if he is hindered at the Crossing-place his soul has tasted death, and if he had crossed the Crossing-place what is that which he said about our Lord that he had crossed it first of all?"' The text is occasionally corrupt but the general sense can be made out. It is difficult to tell whether Bardesanes has altered the Valentinian context, where, for example, the sin of Sophia, not of Adam, is responsible for human misery, or whether Ephraim has drawn Bardesanes more closely within the range of his own ideas than the facts justified. The following parallel is, however, suggestive: 'the Bridal Chamber of Light'; cf. *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 63-65, 35.1; 'hindrance,' cf. use of *κατέχειν*, *Excerpta* 1.2, 22.7, 35, 37, 39; *Irenaeus i. 1, 2*; *Hippolytus, Ref. v. 19, 6*; 'Crossing place,' cf. *Horos-Stauros, Excerpta* 22.4, 42.1; *Irenaeus i. 1, 2*; *i. 1, 6*; *i. 1, 7*; *i. 10 (H)*; *Hippolytus, Ref. vi. 30, 5-6*; *vi. 34, 7*.

¹⁰ Delarue, *IV*, 850-851, 855; van de Sande Bakhuyzen, pp. 172, 176, 190.

In *Excerpta ex Theodoto* both Eastern and Italian christologies are found. Theodotus clearly belongs to the Eastern school, for *Excerpta* 23, 3 says:

αὐτίκα μετὰ τὸ πάθος τοῦ κυρίου καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεστάλη κηρύσσειν· διὸ καὶ καθ' ἐ(κά)τερον ἐκήρυξε τὸν σωτήρα, γεν(ν)ητὸν καὶ παθητὸν διὰ τοὺς ἀριστ(ερ)οὺς, ὅτι τοῦτον γινῶναι δυνηθέντες κατὰ τὸν τόπον τοῦτον δεδίασιν, καὶ κατὰ τὸ πνευματικὸν ἐξ ἁγίου πνεύματος καὶ παρθένου, ὡς οἱ δεξιοὶ ἄγγελοι γινώσκουσιν,

and the words τὸ πνευματικὸν ἐξ ἁγίου πνεύματος καὶ παρθένου are in agreement with Ref. vi. 35, 3. Exc. 60–61, however, represents an Italian theory and is especially interesting for its exegesis of Luke 1, 35. In the Eastern doctrine (Ref. vi. 35, 3–4) the two parts of Luke 1, 35 are referred to the action of the separate powers in the production of Jesus' body: πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σε describes the part played by Sophia, while δύναμις Ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σε states the work of the demiurge. In Exc. 60 πνεῦμα ἐπὶ σε indicates the miracle of Jesus' conception — nothing is said about the constitution of the body — while δύναμις Ὑψίστου κ. τ. λ. refers to the μόρφωσις τοῦ θεοῦ which the preparation of Jesus' body typified but did not itself effect. Exc. 61, 6–8 shows this μόρφωσις to have been the work of the Spirit, that is, Sophia, for it maintains that the death of Jesus was coincident with the departure of the Spirit, who had descended upon him at his baptism and was committed at his death to the Father together with the 'spirituals' whom he had come to save.

The extracts in Irenaeus deal for the most part with the early history of the pleroma, but discussions of Jesus' body are found in Iren. i. 1, 11 (H); i. 1, 13 (H), and in the description of the Marcosian system in i. 14, 1–2 (H). This last passage contains an interesting variety of Italian christology, which appears clearly in the baptismal formula,

εἰς ὄνομα ἀγνώστου πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων, εἰς Ἀλήθειαν μητέρα πάντων, εἰς τὸν κατελθόντα εἰς Ἰησοῦν, εἰς ἔνωσιν καὶ ἀπολύτρωσιν καὶ κοινωνίαν τῶν δυνάμεων.

The third member of this trinity is the Christ who descended upon Jesus and equipped him for the work of redemption, and Iren. i. 14, 1 explains:

τὸ μὲν γὰρ βάπτισμα τοῦ φαινόμενον Ἰησοῦ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν, τὴν δὲ ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ Χριστοῦ κατελθόντος εἰς τελείωσιν· καὶ τὸ μὲν ψυχικὸν τὴν δὲ πνευματικὴν ὑφίστανται.

Here Christ is substituted for the Spirit-Sophia; but the result is the same, Jesus first becomes πνευματικός at his baptism, and before it was so far ψυχικός that he required a baptism for the remission of sins.

Irenaeus i. 1, 13 (H) also represents an Italian view, but in a somewhat more complicated form:

εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ λέγοντες προβαλέσθαι αὐτόν (that is, the demiurge) καὶ Χριστὸν υἱὸν ἴδιον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ψυχικόν· <καὶ> περὶ τούτου διὰ τῶν προφητῶν λελαληκέναι. εἶναι δὲ τοῦτον τὸν διὰ Μαρίας διοδεύσαντα, καθάπερ ὕδωρ διὰ σωλήνος ὁδεύει, καὶ εἰς τοῦτον ἐπὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος κατελθεῖν ἐκείνον τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ πληρώματος ἐκ πάντων σωτήρα ἐν εἰδὲι περιστερᾶς· γεγονέναι δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ <ἀπὸ> τῆς Ἀχαμῶθ σπέρμα πνευματικόν. τὸν οὖν κύριον ἡμῶν ἐκ τεσσάρων τούτων σύνθετον γεγονέναι φάσκουσιν, ἀποσώζοντα τὸν τύπον τῆς ἀρχεγόνου καὶ πρώτης τετρακτύος· ἕκ τε τοῦ πνευματικοῦ, ὃ ἦν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀχαμῶθ, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ψυχικοῦ, ὃ ἦν ἀπὸ τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας, ὃ ἦν κατεσκευασμένος ἀρρήτῳ τέχνῃ, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ σωτήρος, ὃ ἦν κατελθοῦσα εἰς αὐτὸν περιστερὰ.

Here the incorporation of Christ in Jesus is distinguished from the gift of the spiritual seed, though both appear to have taken place at the same time.

Irenaeus i. 1, 11 (H) is more difficult. Referring to the Saviour's mission to save the ψυχικοί, it says:

ὧν γὰρ ἡμελλε σώζειν, τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν εἰληφέναι φάσκουσιν, ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς Ἀχαμῶθ τὸ πνευματικόν, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ ἐνδεδύσθαι τὸν ψυχικὸν Χριστόν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς οἰκονομίας περιτεθεῖσθαι σῶμα ψυχικὴν ἔχον οὐσίαν, κατεσκευασμένον δὲ ἀρρήτῳ τέχνῃ, πρὸς τὸ καὶ ὁρατὸν καὶ ψηλαφητὸν καὶ παθητὸν γεγενῆσθαι· καὶ ὑλικὸν οὐδ' ὅτι οὖν εἰληφέναι λέγουσιν αὐτόν· μὴ γὰρ εἶναι τὴν ὕλην δεκτικὴν σωτηρίας.

Here neither the nativity nor the baptism is mentioned, but the coöperation of the demiurge and Achamoth (Sophia) is described in a way similar to Ref. vi. 35, 4, and there is no suggestion that the 'spiritual' element was received from Sophia at a later time than the 'psychic' element was supplied by the demiurge. With some slight reserve, therefore, this system may be assigned to the Eastern school.

It would be interesting to know whether the Eastern or the Italian form of Valentinian teaching more closely agreed with the view of Valentinus himself. It has been suggested that Hippolytus' principal source was a work of Valentinus, but Hippolytus (Ref. vi. 29, 3) says that he is following a source which agreed with Valentinus in holding that the first principle, the Father, was a sexless, partnerless monad, and it is unnatural to refer to an author's work as remarkable for its agreement with his opinions. There is, however, a fragment of Valentinus preserved by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. iii. 7, 59) which may furnish an answer:

Οὐαλεντίνος δὲ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἀγαθόποδα ἐπιστολῇ " πάντα," φησί, " ὑπομείνας ἐγκρατὴς ἦν· θεότητα Ἰησοῦς εἰργάζετο."

Valentinus would hardly have left undefined the moment at which Jesus achieved the divinity for which his continence had prepared him, and as he denied it to be a native endowment, it is natural to suppose that he dated it at the baptism and that the Italian school followed him in doing so. It is interesting that in this respect Valentinian thought ran a course parallel to Christian doctrine.

NOTES

A GOTHENBURG PAPYRUS AND THE LETTER TO ABGAR

THE resemblance of P. Got. 21 to the letter sent by Jesus to Abgar had already occurred to me when I saw Bell's review¹ of Frisk's publication.² Bell there expresses the opinion that "the text looks like a version of the 'Letter to Abgar.'" It is in reality nothing else.

As Frisk remarks in his description of the papyrus, "on observera que, l. 5. Jésus lui-même porte la parole." The clause ἐγὼ Ἰς χειρεὶ τῇ ἐμῇ ἔγραψα reveals Jesus acting as his own scribe, and ἔγραψα is the usual epistolary aorist. While Frisk has called our attention to this important feature of the text, he has fallen into the not unnatural error of reading the name of Abgar as three distinct words; l. 1]ρὸς αὐτὸν γὰρ ὃν [βασι]λέα αἰδέσεως should be read π]ρὸς Αὐγαρον [βασι]λέα Αἰδέσεως, 'to Abgar king of Edessa.' The text is certainly a fragment of a letter from Jesus to Abgar.

Before discussing the relations of this letter to the hitherto known versions of the Letter to Abgar, I submit a reconstruction of the fragment. I have retained as satisfactory the restorations of the editor: l. 1 [βασι]λέα, 2 ἡ πόλις σου, 3 εἰς τ[ὸν αἰῶνα, and 5 ἐντέλλ[ομαι. I also retain the text as he has printed it, except l. 1 Αὐγαρον instead of αὐτὸν γὰρ ὃν, Αἰδέσεως instead of αἰδέσεως, and 6 διαμαρτύαν (read διαμαρτίαν) instead of διὰ μάρτυαν. The length of the lines varied, I believe, roughly between 47 and 49 letters. With the exception of l. 7, two letter-spaces lie in the lacuna at the beginning of each line. The first line may have been somewhat indented, or the Christian symbol may have stood before π. The letter γ, if broadly written, could have filled the lacuna in l. 5, as I have supposed.

π]ρὸς Αὐγαρον [βασι]λέα Αἰδέσεως, Ἰς Χς Τς Θν [καὶ Τς Μαρίας χαί-
ρε]ιν. μακάριος εἰς, καλῶς σοι ἔσται, καὶ μακαρία ἡ πόλις σου ὅ-
3 τι] ἐπίστευσας. μακάριος σὺ κ(αὶ) ὁ λαός σου ἔσται εἰς [τὸν αἰῶνα
ἐν] τῇ πόλει σου, ἐξανατείλη δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ διανγάζ[ων τὸ φῶς τῆς
γ]ῆς. ἐγὼ Ἰς χειρεὶ τῇ ἐμῇ ἔγραψα. ἐγὼ ἐντέλλ[ομαι ἀποθέσθαι δι-
6 ὄλ]ον διαμαρτύαν, κ(αὶ) ὅπου δ' ἂν προβληθῇ μου τὰ [γράμματα εἴτε ἐν
]κειμένο[ις

1 read 'Εδέσεως

6 read διαμαρτίαν

¹ Classical Review, XLIII, 6, p. 237.

² Hjalmar Frisk, Papyrus grecs de la Bibliothèque Municipale de Gothenbourg, Göteborg, 1929.

The praescriptio of the present fragment is unique among the versions of the Letter to Abgar. This fact is remarkable inasmuch as the praescriptio is regular in the versions of Abgar's letter to Christ. The form here, however, is definitely Christian,³ since Jesus as the writer of the letter places his own name after that of Abgar, despite the superiority that attaches to his person and comes to expression in his name Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Υἱὸς Θεοῦ. In the praescriptio of Abgar's letter to Christ, on the other hand, with the exception of the version in Acta Thaddaei,⁴ the non-Christian origin of the letter is indicated by the precedence of Abgar's name.

The name of Jesus in the form here employed — Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Υἱὸς Θεοῦ — occurs elsewhere in the correspondence only in Epistula Abgari,⁵ where it is completed with καὶ υἱὸς Μαρίας. The text of Eusebius does not have the name of Jesus within the body of the letter.⁶ The other versions of the letter properly so called⁷ follow Eusebius with some change and addition. Hence I have thought best to fill the lacuna by writing the complete name as it is read in Epistula Abgari.

The close association of Abgar and his city in the blessing bestowed by Jesus is common to our fragment and Epistula Abgari, but not to the others. Another distinctive mark of P. Got. and Epistula Abgari is the use of the finite verb ἐπίστευσας. Elsewhere the participle πιστεύσας is universal. P. Got. seems to have had nothing corresponding either to μὴ ἑωρακώς με or to the pseudo-citation introduced by γέγραπται in all the texts of the letter known to me. Perhaps this omission accounts for the repetition of the blessing in P. Got.

The clause beginning with ἐξανατείλῃ and ending with]ης is without parallel. The figure embodied in ἐξανατείλῃ and διανυγάζ[ων, as I restore the word, has led me to complete the sentence with τὸ φῶς τῆς γῆς and to understand the whole as a reference to the establishment of the Christian Church in Edessa. The phrase recalls the well-

³ Ghedini, *Lettere Cristiane*, Milan, 1923, pp. 12 f.

⁴ Lipsius, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, pars prior, p. 274, l. 3. Since the so-called Christian form of the praescriptio was early current among non-Christians when the writer was of rank inferior to that of the person whom he was addressing (Ghedini, loc. cit.), the form of the praescriptio in Acta Thaddaei is not necessarily Christian.

⁵ Lipsius, p. 281, l. 17.

⁶ Schwartz-Mommsen, *Eusebius Werke*, II. 1, p. 88 (*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, Leipzig, 1903).

⁷ In Acta Thaddaei the message is transmitted by word of mouth and hence is considerably abbreviated.

known words of Jesus: ὑμεῖς ἐστε τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου.⁸ The verb ἐξανατείλῃ is a futuristic subjunctive in an independent clause,⁹ and as such in harmony with the chronology of the legend in accordance with which the church was established in Edessa by Thaddaeus after the passion of Jesus and so some time after the Letter to Abgar was written. The word διανυγάξ[ων, for its part, appears to play on the name of Abgar in such manner as to imply that the church will be established in Edessa δι' Αὐγάρου.

The signatory sentence ἐγὼ Ἰς χειρὶ τῇ ἐμῇ ἔγραψα was my first clue to the identification of the fragment and has a real importance for the relations of P. Got. and the other versions. To parallel the expression we must again resort to Epistula Abgari, where the clause runs ὁ λόγος γραπτὸς γέγραπται τῇ ἰδίᾳ μου χειρί. This does not enter into the composition of the other Greek texts.

Like the praescriptio and l. 4 ἐξανατείλῃ . . . [γ]ῆς, l. 6 ἐγὼ ἐντέλλ[ομαι] . . . διαμαρτύαν is peculiar to P. Got. What remains of the sentence seems to me to compel, from the standpoint of sense, such a restoration as I have attempted. Its relation to the following sentence is exactly that of ἔστω δὲ ὁ φορῶν αὐτὴν ἄνθρωπος ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ πράγματος to the corresponding sentence in Epistula Abgari.

The final and mutilated clause is only the beginning of a considerable sentence, which is read in full in Epistula Abgari and its Slavic paraphrase,¹⁰ but not at all elsewhere. Naturally, then, my restoration of l. 6 follows the text of Epistula Abgari, and particularly in view of the agreements between it and P. Got. that have already been discussed. I have not dared suggest what might have stood between the end of this line and the first letter preserved in l. 7, but the series of dative participles in Epistula Abgari makes κειμένοις practically certain.

To sum up, the fragmentary text of P. Got. 21 shows close points of contact with the text of Epistula Abgari, and none of significance with the version recorded by Eusebius and its derivatives. At the

⁸ Matt. 5, 14. References to patristic literature for the use of φῶς to describe the body of Christians are to be found in Suicer, Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, which I have not been able to consult. A convenient list of the Christian significations of the word is in Stephanus, Thesaurus Graecae Linguae, VIII, p. 1202.

⁹ Jannaris, Historical Greek Grammar, App. V, 20 B; Moulton, Grammar of New Testament Greek: Prolegomena, p. 240.

¹⁰ E. von Dobschütz, Christusbilder, p. 203* ff. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 1899).

same time, P. Got. has unique readings which cannot be explained by reference to any other version.

Bell's suggestion that the papyrus "may well be a Christian amulet" is quite likely. The final mutilated sentence is of distinctly magical import, and the Slavic version supplements the passage with directions for the effective utilization of the Letter:

Wir berichten aber [to quote from Dobschütz' translation]¹¹ es ist geschrieben mit der Hand unseres Herrn Jesu Christi, des gnädigen und barmherzigen menschenliebenden Gottes, zu kommen über den Leidenden mit Gottesfurcht. Wer da lesen wird dreimal dieses Schreiben über einem Leidenden und danach sagen wird dem Leidenden: "Der Herr unser Gott wird dich aufrichten, der aufrichtet hat den Abgar vom Lager, da er krank war, liegend 6 Jahre. Richte auf deinen Knecht N. N., weil er gläubig deinen heiligen Namen anruft, ihn der dieses Schreiben trägt, es lesend durch mich den Sünder N. N., dass es ihm sei zur Reinigung der Seele und des Leibes, damit er dir diene alle Tage seines Lebens in Wahrheit und Recht, der du bist der menschenliebende Christus unser Gott, lehrend und noch mehr heilend, dich preisen wir mit dem Vater und mit dem heiligen Geist u. s. w."

But even apart from this striking piece of evidence for the use of the Letter to Abgar in healing, it is well known that copies of the Letter enjoyed wide circulation as charms to be fixed on the doorpost or wall of a house.¹²

HERBERT C. YOUTIE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

THE MEANING OF 'AUTHORITY' IN MARK 1, 22

He entered into the synagogue and taught. And they were astonished at his teaching, for he taught them as one having authority and not as the scribes (Mk. 1, 21-22).

The accepted interpretation of Mark 1, 21 f. is well known. In the words of Herford, the passage means that Jesus taught "with the spiritual force of a tremendous personality," and this was bound to shock his contemporaries who adhered to the idea of Torah.¹ Such a view has the advantage of making the material self-explanatory, while it receives corroboration both from other data in the gospels

¹¹ E. von Dobschütz, p. 206*, l. 131.

¹² E. von Dobschütz, pp. 124, 179; Hennecke, *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, Tübingen, 1904, p. 161.

¹ R. T. Herford, *Pharisaism, Its Aim and Its Methods*, 1912, p. 168.

regarding Jesus' personal traits and from facts derived from the Judaistic sources concerning the Pharisaic method of teaching.

Nevertheless I should like to propose a fresh approach to this passage. I should like to suggest, namely, that it reflects a "conflict-situation," not of the time and place of Jesus' career but of the circumstances and experiences of the group among whom this gospel arose as a gospel. Accepting Bacon's argument,² I shall assume that our passage was intended to appeal to a group in Rome. And in view of the current widespread agreement on the chronological order of the Synoptic gospels, I shall also assume that Mark 1, 21 f. is the original from which the parallels, Matthew 7, 29 and Luke 4, 32, were derived.

Jesus is alleged to have been distinguished from his inferior fellow Jews by a certain quality, namely, *ἐξουσία*. The first question before us is then: What was the nature of this quality as understood by Mark's public? It seems to me that *ἐξουσία* in our passage means a mysterious superhuman force whereby demons were controlled and afflictions miraculously healed.

First it will be necessary to examine the ten occurrences of this term found in Mark.

13, 34; a mundane usage: 'the power of agency,' 'Vollmacht.' Cremer, *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch*, p. 402, under 1.

11, 28-33 (four times); the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem demand of Jesus: *ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς*, referring apparently to the sum total of his achievements. The retort is framed as a question, the implied answer apparently being that the baptism of John was (by *ἐξουσία*) of heaven.

2, 10; the interest is centred on the power to forgive sins, but that general prerogative has manifested itself in the miraculous healing of a paralytic.³ The latter detail has been subsequently considered of subsidiary value, so that it has already disappeared from view by the time of Hermas, by whom Jesus' *ἐξουσία* over repentance is mentioned twice (Mand. 4, 3, 5; Sim. 8, 3, 5).

3, 15; 6, 7; the control of evil spirits. Cremer, p. 403: "Befähigung, Vermögen, Macht . . . bes. gern von d. Wundermacht."

1, 27; the power of healing by exorcising an unclean spirit.

1, 22 should be viewed as adumbrating the usage in vs. 27, to which it stands clearly as part of an introductory statement.⁴ Cremer ex-

² B. W. Bacon, *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* Cambridge, Mass., 1919.

³ Cremer, citing the parallel, Matt. 9, 6, groups the passage together with Matt. 21, 23 (= Mk. 11, 28).

⁴ See Bacon, p. 3.

plains it as a combination of "Vollmacht u. Gewalt Gottes," citing Jos. Antiq. v. 1, 26 and xviii. 6, 9, and adds "ebenso in bezug auf die d. Messias Gottes verliehene u. sich in seinem Wirken kundgebende Vollmacht . . . der innerl. von Gott her d. Auftrag u. d. Kraft, die sich d. Worten bekundet," citing Luke 4, 36 = Mark 1, 27.

It is significant that despite the location of this event in a synagogue, the statement that Jesus taught (repeated once) is not followed by any didactic material. The gospel writer sees no objection to asserting simply that Jesus' *manner* of teaching argued his possession of *ἐξουσία*, and then passing on to an account of the manifestation of that quality, without any further account of what seems to be here the less important matter of the content of that teaching. Cf. 2, 13; 6, 2. 6. The emphasis falls plainly on the act of exorcising in vs. 27, to which the *ἐξουσία* of our verse points, and in which it finds its fulfilment.

From the foregoing analysis it appears that in Mark 1, 22 the term in question cannot be adequately explained in the general sense of an extraordinary and superhuman or divinely delegated power. Its situation requires that it have the definite, specific sense in which the same word is used later in the same narrative, namely, 'the power to cure by exorcism.' This nuance recurs in 3, 15 and 6, 7, is akin to the usage in 2, 10, and is apparently included in the generalized references to Jesus' *ἐξουσία* in 11, 28-33.⁵

Now what importance is to be assigned to this term from the point of view of social history? There can be little doubt that Mark's public would have been vitally interested in the attribution to Jesus of just such a quality as seems to be signified by *ἐξουσία* in our passage. One of the traits which seems to have differentiated the early followers of Jesus from the Jews was the pervasive religious coloring of therapeutic notions and practices.⁶ Concretely speaking, the atmosphere of Rome was permeated with the contentions of such rival healing-cults as those of Dionysus, Serapis, and Asklepios. With Mark's evident interest in miraculous healing there need be little doubt that the cult of Jesus in Rome participated in activities of the same general

⁵ The occurrence of *ἐξουσία*, in a sense similar to that in which Mark uses it in nine of its ten cases, in Corpus Hermeticum i. 32 and xiii. 17 is mentioned by Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, 3d ed. (1927), p. 363; cf. 2d ed., p. 101, where Mark 1, 22 is cited in the same connection. The problem of the probable affinity of the cult of Jesus in Rome to that of contemporary religious societies is discussed below, in so far as it concerns our passage.

⁶ Case, *Experience with the Supernatural in Early Christian Times*, pp. 236 ff.

type as those of the rival cults. Now by attributing to Jesus *ἐξουσία*, the power to heal and exorcise, just before describing that quality in action, the gospel writer means to claim a high religious value for the exorcistic and other modes of therapeutic activities to which his group adhered. As regards the rival cults, the early Christians were convinced that by virtue of their "Great Physician" they were superior to those.⁷ But of the Jews, with whom the conflict was undoubtedly more bitter, the gospel asserts that they were devoid of just that power which was so important an element in Jesus' superiority, and, by implication, in that of his followers.

JOSHUA STARR

NEW YORK, N. Y.

"ADHUC IN CORPORE CONSTITUTO"

IN MY *Studies in Matthew* (1930, pp. 452 ff.) the reader will find a brief statement of my conviction that the long debated Papias-testimony prefixed by a medieval prologue-writer to the *Gospel* of John was originally meant for the *Revelation*. Arguments and references there given need not be repeated here because the present note is concerned only with the final clause of the fragment; but since this is obscure it may be advisable to print it in full side by side with the conjectured original.

REV. 1, 9-11

I, John, was in the isle that is called Patmos. . . . I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and I heard a great voice saying, What thou seest, write in a book and send it to the seven churches [of Asia].

PAPIAS

Manifestatum et datum est ecclesiis (*var.* in Asia) a Iohanne, adhuc in corpore constituto.

(Compare the Ethiopic subscription to Revelation: Visio . . . quam vidit in vita sua; et scripta fuit a beato Iohanne.)

Papias is known to have championed the 'credibility' of Revelation, on which his millennial beliefs were founded; but objections to his having borne witness to the apostolic authorship of the Gospel of John are generally conceded to be insuperable. Nevertheless excellent scholars, such as Clemen, still maintain the authenticity of the fragment without detaching it from the Gospel. Apparently those who continue thus to side with the prologue-writer take the last four words of the fragment to rest upon the Appendix to the Gospel, where the

⁷ Case, pp. 244 f.

saying current regarding the Apostle's death is mentioned (John 21, 20-25).

Unfortunately for the supposed reference the reader of the Appendix necessarily infers just the contrary of the statement of the prologue. To say nothing of the inappropriateness of referring to the Gospel as a 'revelation' (*manifestatum*), it obviously was not "given out to the churches" (at least in its present form) while its author was "yet in the body." On the contrary, from the earliest times it has been recognized that the publication of the Gospel was due to others who survived the author.

What meaning, then, can be given to the curious affirmation of Papias (for I regard the fragment as wholly authentic), supported as it is by the Ethiopic subscription? Surely every reader must be impelled to ask: How else but in his lifetime can an author be expected to see a vision or publish it in a book? The statement is peculiar — so peculiar indeed that it would be inapplicable to any other book we can imagine save the Revelation of John. But the early history of the Revelation makes it precisely the kind of affirmation we should expect from defenders of this book in the period of Papias.

R. H. Charles in his *Commentary on Revelation* (I, pp. xlvii f.) recalls, without explaining, the two conflicting patristic dates for the book. Epiphanius (*Haer.* li. 33) places it "in the times of Claudius," having reference, no doubt, to the well known era of the Apostolic Dispersion (A.D. 42). This dating (before Paul's coming to Ephesus) is also implied in the *Muratorianum*. But the later dating, found in Irenaeus (*Haer.* v. 33, 3) and later, "The vision was seen . . . toward the end of the reign of Domitian," ultimately, as Charles points out (p. 1), "displaced the earlier." The change had become unavoidable. For Revelation encountered from the start opposition critical in character and formidable in weight. Such opposition could not fail to point out incompatibility with the tradition in its earlier form of indications of a much later date such as abound in Rev. 1-3. Now Papias had borne witness to the martyrdom of John not later than 66 A.D. at the hands of the Jews in fulfilment of Matt. 20, 33, and was therefore precluded from dating Revelation under Domitian. The only alternative for him and those likeminded, if unwilling to yield to the fatal implications of the internal evidence, was to maintain that the vision, for all its implied knowledge of later events, was seen "in the Spirit" by John, and published "while he was yet in the body." As late as 180, as we have seen, defenders still clung to this date. In the meantime, however, the lifetime of John was extended as the

legend came into vogue to which reference is made in John 21, 22-24. Thereafter, but only thereafter, the Irenaeus date became possible. In Papias' time defenders of the 'prophecy' could only maintain its 'credibility' by insisting that, in spite of references such as Rev. 2, 13, nevertheless the vision was seen by John during his lifetime; or, as Papias put it, paralleling more closely the statements of the book itself, "It was revealed and given out to the churches by John while yet in the body."

BENJAMIN W. BACON

YALE UNIVERSITY

BOOKS RECEIVED

- THE MIND OF CHRIST IN PAUL: Light from Paul on Present Problems of Christian Thinking. *By Frank Chamberlin Porter.* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930. Pp. xiii, 323. \$2.50.
- PATHWAYS TO CERTAINTY. *By William Adams Brown.* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930. Pp. xiv, 293. \$2.50.
- THE FISHERMEN'S SAINT. *By Sir Wilfred Grenfell.* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930. Pp. ix, 56. \$1.00.
- THE PATH TO PEACE: Essays and Addresses on Peace and its Making. *By Nicholas Murray Butler.* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930. Pp. xiii, 320. \$2.50.
- THE ENLARGEMENT OF PERSONALITY: Behaviour Patterns and their Formation. *By John Hopkins Denison.* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930. Pp. xxii, 340. \$3.00.
- CHRIST IN THE GOSPELS. *By Burton Scott Easton.* The Hale Lectures, 1929-30. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930. Pp. ix, 209. \$1.75.
- ST. PAUL'S EPHESIAN MINISTRY: a Reconstruction with special reference to the Ephesian Origin of the Imprisonment Epistles. *By George S. Duncan.* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930. Pp. xiv, 303. \$2.25.
- THE PROTESTANT ETHIC AND THE SPIRIT OF CAPITALISM. *By Max Weber.* Translated by Talcott Parsons. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930. Pp. xi, 292. \$3.00.
- THE COMING RELIGION. *By Nathaniel Schmidt.* New York, The Macmillan Co., 1930. Pp. 262. \$2.00.
- THE MYSTIC WILL; based on a Study of the Philosophy of Jacob Boehme. *By Howard H. Brinton.* New York, The Macmillan Co., 1930. Pp. xiii, 269. \$2.50.
- HEBREW RELIGION: its Origin and Development. *By W. O. E. Oesterly and Theodore H. Robinson.* New York, The Macmillan Co., 1930. Pp. xxiv, 400. \$2.50.
- HEBREW REBORN. *By Shalom Spiegel.* New York, The Macmillan Co., 1930. Pp. xiv, 479. \$3.00.
- THE PURITAN MIND. *By Herbert Wallace Schneider.* Studies in Religion and Culture. American Religion Series I. New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1930. Pp. 301. \$3.00.
- JESUS THE SON OF GOD. *By Benjamin Wisner Bacon.* The Kent Shaffer Memorial Lectures in Yale University, 1930. New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1930. Pp. x, 152. \$1.50.
- STUDIES IN MATTHEW. *By Benjamin W. Bacon.* New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1930. Pp. xxvi, 533. \$5.00.
- BELIEF UNBOUND: A Promethean Religion for the Modern World. *By Wm. Pepperell Montague.* The Terry Lectures. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1930. Pp. 98. \$1.50.
- PSEUDO-EZEKIEL AND THE ORIGINAL PROPHECY. *By Charles Cutler Torrey.* Yale Oriental Series. Researches. Vol. XVIII. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1930. Pp. 119. \$2.00.

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

- YULE LIGHT:** a Christmas Pageant in two parts based upon old Folk Songs and ancient Carols. *By Alexander Van Rensselaer and Frank Butcher.* New York, The Century Co., 1930. Pp. xviii, 41. 75 cents.
- MAN AND SOCIETY:** an Introduction to Sociology. *By Francis J. Haas.* The Century Catholic College Texts. New York, The Century Co., 1930. Pp. xviii, 456. \$3.50.
- AN INTRODUCTORY STUDY OF THE FAMILY.** *By Edgar Schmiedeler.* The Century Catholic College Texts. New York, The Century Co., 1930. Pp. xi, 384. \$2.50.
- LIBERTY AND RELIGION:** the First Century of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. *By Sydney Herbert Mellone.* Boston, The Beacon Press, 1930. Pp. 238. \$1.50.
- THE DIVINE ELEMENT IN ART AND LITERATURE.** *By William Lawrence Schroeder.* Boston, The Beacon Press, 1930. Pp. viii, 268. \$1.50.
- CHRISTIANITY AND THE RELIGIOUS DRAMA.** *By R. H. U. Bloor.* The Essex Hall Lecture, 1928. Boston, The Beacon Press, 1930. Pp. 64. \$1.10.
- HINDUISM INVADES AMERICA.** *By Wendell Thomas.* Boston, The Beacon Press, 1930. Pp. 300. \$3.00.
- KANT'S CONCEPTION OF GOD:** a Critical Exposition of its Metaphysical Development together with a translation of the *Nova Dilucidatio.* *By F. E. England.* New York, The Dial Press, 1930. Pp. 256.
- SPIRIT IN EVOLUTION,** from Amoeba to Saint. *By Herbert F. Standing.* New York, The Dial Press, 1930. Pp. 312.
- THE PERSON OF EVOLUTION:** the Outer Consciousness, the Outer Knowledge, the Directive Power: Studies of Instinct as Contributions to a Philosophy of Evolution. *By W. D. Lighthall.* Montreal, H. A. Kennedy Co., 1930. Pp. 216.
- A CRITICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE WORKS OF RABBI ISAAC BAER LEVINSOHN.** *By Louis S. Greenberg.* New York, Bloch Publishing Co., 1930. Pp. 80 \$2.00.
- A HISTORY OF JEWISH LITERATURE** from the Close of the Bible to our own Days. *By Meyer Waxman.* Vol. I. From the Close of the Canon to the End of the Twelfth Century. New York, Bloch Publishing Co., 1930. Pp. xvi, 501. \$3.50.
- SEVEN MINOR TREATISES:** Sefer Torah; Mezuzah; Tefillin; Zizit; 'Abadim; Kutim; Gerin: and Treatise Soferim II. Edited from Manuscripts with an Introduction, Notes, Variants, and Translation *by Michael Higger.* New York, Bloch Publishing Co., 1930. Pp. 56, 87.
- MENORAT HA-MAOR** by R. Israel Ibn al-Nakawa from a unique Manuscript in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. Part II. New York, Bloch Publishing Co., 1930. Pp. 48, 460. \$6.00.
- JUDAH BEN SOLOMON CAMPANTON AND HIS "ARBA'AH KINYANIN."** *By Elhanan H. Golomb.* (Thesis.) Philadelphia, Dropsie College, 1930. Pp. v, 110. \$2.00.
- A HISTORY OF VICARAGES IN THE MIDDLE AGES.** *By R. A. R. Hartridge.* Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought. Cambridge University Press, 1930. Pp. x, 273. 15 shillings.
- RABBINIC LITERATURE AND GOSPEL TEACHINGS.** *By C. G. Montefiore.* London, Macmillan and Co., 1930. Pp. xxii, 442. \$5.50.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- DIE RELIGION IN GESCHICHTE UND GEGENWART.** Lieferungen 79-86. Tübingen, Mohr, 1930. 3.60 marks each.
- AUS DER WERKSTATT DES VOLLENDETEN.** *By Adolf von Harnack.* (Als Abschluss seiner Reden und Aufsätze hrsg. von Axel von Harnack.) Giessen, Töpelmann, 1930. Pp. 293. 11 marks.
- CATHEDRA PETRI:** Neue Untersuchungen über die Anfänge der Primatslehre. *By Hugo Koch.* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 11.) Giessen, Töpelmann, 1930. Pp. xii, 188. 12 marks.
- DAS RÄTSEL DES JACOBUSBRIEFES.** *By Arnold Meyer.* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 10.) Giessen, Töpelmann, 1930. Pp. xii, 336. 20 marks.
- S. AURELII AUGUSTINI DE DOCTRINA CHRISTIANA LIBROS QUATTUOR edidit Henr. Jos. Vogels.** (Florilegium Patristicum, Fasc. XXIV.) Bonn, P. Hanstein, 1930. Pp. vi, 103. 5 marks.
- FLORILEGIUM PATRISTICUM.** Ed. Geyer et Zellinger. Fasc. IV. Tertulliani liber de Praescriptione Haereticorum, addito Irenaei Adversus Haereses libro III, 3-4 recensuit J. Martin.
Fasc. VIII. Minucii Felicis Octavius recensuit J. Martin.
Fasc. XXIII. Augustini liber de Videndo Deo seu Epistula 147, ed. M. Schmaus. Bonn, Hanstein, 1930. 2; 3.60; and 1.50 marks.
- SS. EUSEBII HIERONYMI ET AURELII AUGUSTINI EPISTOLAE MUTUAE, edidit, prolegomenis et notis intruxit Josefus Schmid.** (Florilegium Patristicum. Fasc. XXII.) Bonn, P. Hanstein, 1930. Pp. 128. 5.60 marks.
- MARTIN LUTHER VOM KATHOLIZISMUS ZUR REFORMATION.** *By Otto Scheel.* II. Band: Im Kloster. 3. und 4. Auflage. Tübingen, Mohr, 1930. Pp. xii, 694. 33.60 marks.
- CHRISTUS AM KREUZ IN DER BILDKUNST DER KAROLINGERZEIT.** *By Johannes Riel.* (Studien über Christliche Denkmäler, 21. Heft.) Leipzig, Dietrich, 1930. Pp. 127. 10 marks.
- RECHTFERTIGUNGSLEHRE UND CHRISTUSGLAUBE:** eine Untersuchung zur Systematik der Rechtfertigungslehre Luthers in ihren Anfängen. *By Hans Joachim Iwand.* Leipzig, Heinrichs, 1930. Pp. vi, 128. 5 marks.
- AURELIUS AUGUSTINUS:** die Festschrift der Görresgesellschaft zum 1500. Todestage des heiligen Augustinus. *Martin Grabmann and Joseph Mausbach, editors.* Köln, J. P. Bachem, 1930. Pp. xi, 438. 30 marks.
- LUTHER-JAHRBUCH, 1930.** Jahrbuch der Luther-Gesellschaft. *Hrsg. von Th. Knolle.* Jahrgang xii, 1930. München, Kaiser. Pp. viii, 223.
- LE PIÉTISME JUIF DANS LES TESTAMENTS DES DOUZE PATRIARCHES.** *By Robert Eppel.* (Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses publiées par la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de l'Université de Strasbourg.) Paris, Félix Alcan, 1930. Pp. viii, 202. 30 francs.
- LE PROBLÈME LITTÉRAIRE ET HISTORIQUE DU ROMAN PSEUDO-CLÉMENTIN.** Etude sur le Rapport entre le Gnosticisme et le Judéo-Christianisme. *By Oscar Cullmann.* (Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses publiées par la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de l'Université de Strasbourg. No. 23.) Paris, Félix Alcan, 1930. Pp. viii, 271. 35 francs.
- ANDREAS RIVETUS ALS INVLOEDRIJK GEREFORMEERD THEOLOG IN HOLLAND'S BLOETIJD.** *By H. J. Honders.* The Hague, M. Nijhoff, 1930. Pp. 195. 4 gulden.

